

BS
2521
T9

~~Div. Lib.~~

Gen. lib.

The University of Chicago
Libraries



356
The Study of the
NEW TESTAMENT

1883 and 1920

*An Inaugural Lecture
delivered before the University of Oxford
on October 22 and 29, 1920*

BY

CUTHBERT H. TURNER, M.A.

*Dean Ireland's Professor of Exegesis in the
University of Oxford*

OXFORD
AT THE CLARENDON PRESS

1920

The Study of the NEW TESTAMENT

1883 and 1920

*An Inaugural Lecture
delivered before the University of Oxford
on October 22 and 29, 1920*

BY

CUTHBERT H. TURNER, M.A.

*Dean Ireland's Professor of Exegesis in the
University of Oxford*

OXFORD
AT THE CLARENDON PRESS

1920

135 2521
T9

ADVERTISEMENT

<i>Introduction</i>	p. 3
I. <i>The Second Century and the Canon</i>	p. 7
II. <i>The Apostolic Fathers</i>	p. 13
III. <i>The Apostolic Age</i>	p. 15
IV. <i>The Epistles</i>	p. 18
V. <i>The Apocalypse and the Acts</i>	p. 25
VI. <i>The Gospels</i>	p. 32
VII. <i>The Synoptic Problem</i>	p. 36
VIII. <i>The Text of the New Testament</i>	p. 48
IX. <i>The Language of the New Testament</i>	p. 63
X. <i>Patristic Exegesis of the New Testament</i>	p. 65

Apology is needed for the delay in the appearance of what has grown under the writer's hands to larger proportions than he originally contemplated. The first thirty pages were delivered (with some omissions) substantially as they now stand on October 22: the second part has been subjected since delivery to a good deal of change, the material of some pages was given on a third occasion, while the last few pages have been added to avoid obvious incompleteness in the treatment. Even so, this Lecture does not pretend to do more than call attention to some not unimportant aspects of a very large department of study.

THE STUDY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

1883 AND 1920

THE first name that would have occurred to me, of those whom I should most have wished to number among my audience to-day, is the name of William Sanday, the fourth holder of the Chair to the succession of which I have recently been called by the generous indulgence of the electors. Dean Ireland's Chair is of comparatively modern foundation: its tradition rests not on length of years but on the more exacting heritage of the distinction of the scholars who have adorned it; Edward Hawkins (1847-1861), to be remembered here not as the candidate preferred to Keble for the Oriel Provostship, nor as the head who ejected Newman from the Oriel tutorship, but as author of the *Bampton Lectures* on Tradition, and therein of the well-known formula 'The Church to teach, the Bible to prove': Robert Scott (1861-1870), joint-author of the great *Lexicon*, and therefore an imperishable name among English scholars: Henry Parry Liddon (1870-1882), whose polished style and clear-cut features suggested some pulpit orator of the great age of the Church of France, while his impassioned zeal and his devoted study of Scripture recalled rather the most eloquent of all the expositors of St. Paul, John Chrysostom of the Golden Mouth: William Sanday, whom to-day we mourn, and Walter Lock, of whom I may not, here and now, say all I would, my immediate predecessors, both of them to me the kindest friends and patrons, to whom, with William Bright, it is due that I was able to stay on in Oxford when prospects were not too rosy and I had

almost made up my mind to seek employment in other studies elsewhere.

This is not the occasion to speak of Dr. Sanday, save for what he was and did as Ireland Professor during the twelve and a half years from the beginning of 1883 to the summer of 1895. His Inaugural Lecture was delivered a few months before I took my degree and began the more systematic study of the history and theology of the primitive Church. I well remember how in those early years I read and re-read the Lecture, and on reading it again I am as sure as ever that my first reverence and admiration were not misplaced. I cannot do better to-day than take it for the starting-point of my own address, as I attempt to estimate some of the main lines of research, some of the principal acquisitions of knowledge, some of the new avenues opened up, that have marked the course of the work done on the New Testament, and subjects ancillary to it, during the last thirty-seven years. *Generatio et generatio laudabit opera Tua.*

In studying his Inaugural Lecture in preparation for my own there is one obvious contrast that is only too vividly borne in on me. He speaks throughout with high hope, and with unabated confidence of fulfilment, about all the methods of teaching and lines of research to which he intends to give himself: he had published two books, but he dwells much less on what he had done than on what he meant to do. At the time when he delivered the lecture he was still some months under forty; I, conscious of sixty years behind me, have to justify myself more by the past than by the future, and must be chary of promises to-day. Autumn, whatever its merits, is not the same as early summer.

When Dr. Sanday returned to Oxford as Ireland Professor, neither the duties nor the stipend of his Chair were excessive (the founder having doubtless anticipated that those who should be successively elected

to it would possess some other source of University or College emolument), and he accepted, and retained throughout his tenure of the Chair, an official Fellowship at Exeter College as Tutor in Theology, together with the theological teaching at Trinity. Nevertheless, in spite of the duplication of duties, he was able to develop the work of the Chair on new and important lines. He had and he maintained, far beyond any of his predecessors or successors, an astonishingly extensive knowledge of the work being done on his subject abroad, both in Germany and in America—he never, I think, felt the same first-hand interest in French work, and of course it is true that most of the best French and Belgian work is being done on subjects outside the New Testament—and in this respect we who come after him make but a poor show at best. It would have been a great loss to English theological scholarship in general, if it had not had in Dr. Sanday a representative who could join hands on our behalf across both the seas. Yet I have not always been able to banish the suspicion that there would have been some gain in result, had he been less engrossed in other people's work and less diffident about his own.

Equally significant was his constant endeavour to gather younger scholars round him, and attract them to grapple under his superintendence with some of the problems which he thought most pressing in the sphere of New Testament study. The meetings were called by the German name of 'Seminar', but Dr. Sanday disclaimed any personal experience of German methods: and indeed, when I call to my recollection the elaborate equipment which the Professor of Mediaeval History at Munich displayed to me with pardonable pride—a set of three communicating rooms in the University Buildings, one for the Professor, one for the joint use of the Professor and his class, and the third a workshop, so to say, with reference library, for the students themselves—and

contrast all this with our informal meetings in the Professor's dining-room, and the discursiveness of our conversations (but perhaps for that feature I was responsible myself), I seem to see an image of the difference between the English and the German temperament, reflected also in the difference between English and German output. But if the Seminar dawdled, and was not businesslike, and mislaid its notes, and arrived at no final conclusions, I am sure that younger scholars received stimulus and inspiration, and Sanday would have held I think that that was better training for us than to produce cock-sure theses and print premature dissertations.

I do not know that the far-sightedness of Dr. Sanday's judgement could be better illustrated than in his choice of the subject-matter propounded by him for investigation by his two Seminars. I cannot be quite certain that the selection goes back to the very first institution of the Seminars : but at any rate from near the beginning the one applied itself to the Synoptic problem, the other to the Western text of the New Testament. Yet when he came back to Oxford the prevailing view among critics was that Westcott and Hort's Greek Testament had solved the textual question once for all, and indeed there are quarters where that superstition lingers still. And Dr. Foakes-Jackson assures us¹ that men were told at Cambridge in the nineties that there was no longer a Synoptic problem to solve. Perhaps Sanday was inclined to keep too many questions in a state of suspended animation ; but that is better than the risk of premature burial, and the two subjects which his prescience singled out more than a quarter of a century ago are still very much alive indeed.

His lectures during his twelve years as Ireland Professor were practically concentrated on one single topic. Occasionally he gave a course on Textual Criticism,

¹ *Constructive Quarterly*, June 1920, p. 326.

once at least on the Theology of St. Paul, but regularly, during not less than two terms in each year, he lectured on the Epistle to the Romans. Critics might say that such a limitation is not ideal, either for the Professor himself or for the Faculty; but sound as may be the general principle, no one can regret a line of action that resulted in the publication of the epoch-making Commentary on the Epistle, which Sanday, in conjunction with our present Regius Professor, Dr. Headlam, contributed to the *International Critical* series. Its publication was exactly contemporaneous with the close of his connexion with the Chair. When in the summer of 1895 he was transferred to the Lady Margaret foundation, he left in the Commentary on Romans an enduring monument of his tenure of the Ireland Professorship.

I

Dr. Sanday in his Inaugural Lecture puts, after some preliminary paragraphs, the question what are the subjects which fall within the province of the Chair of Exegesis, and finds them so manifold that they cannot be enumerated under less than seven different heads. I shall adopt the substance of his definition, keeping myself free, where it seems advisable, to rearrange its details on rather simpler lines.

First came the History of the Formation of the Canon of the New Testament. Obviously we are taken here out of New Testament times: the conscious formation of the Canon, and the attempts, even the earliest, at sketching out a rule for inclusion and exclusion of individual books, belong only to the second century, not to the first, and the process was not completed for two centuries more. But the idea of a New Testament was more or less fixed by about A.D. 150, and in the age of Irenaeus and Tertullian and Origen substantial agreement had been reached about its contents.

In this particular respect, then, the history of the

Christian Church and of Christian literature down to about the middle of the third century is a necessary part of the province of New Testament study. But as one whose main work has lain in the centuries after the first, rather than in the first itself, I should like to make a further plea on behalf of this wider knowledge, and urge that in the study of the New Testament, as indeed in every branch of special study, the true scholar must extend his sphere of knowledge, outwards from its centre, in some one direction or another: He must acquire for himself some standard of comparison, he must be able to set his studies in relation to something outside themselves, or his work will be unintelligent and unfruitful. In the case of the New Testament the student's subordinate research may take the direction either of the preparation in Judaism, or of the fulfilment in the Christian Church, or of the background in the pagan world. Best of all, it goes without saying, if he make himself master of each: but life is brief, special studies become more and more absorbing, and the essential thing is to have some one corrective to the dangers of a concentrated specialism. For myself, I am sadly conscious of comparative unfamiliarity with some of the branches of New Testament study: I can only hope that it is not without profit to bring the trained experience of a historian and critic, acquired in a closely related sphere, to bear upon the problems of the first Christian century. If there is one principle more than another which I have proclaimed in season and out of season, it is that historically you cannot draw an arbitrary line between the apostolic and the sub-apostolic age, between the literature that was collected into the New Testament and the literature of the succeeding generations. The history of the Christian Church began with Pentecost: after that there is no clear dividing line between one period and the next till you come to the Edict of Gallienus in 261 or the Edict of Milan in

313. To write, as even in recent times some eminent historians have done, the history of the Christian Church and exclude from it the lives and work of the apostles is indeed a worse mistake than to write the history of the apostles without reference to the history of the churches they founded ; but the latter is a mistake all the same. History cannot be constructed, like ships, in water-tight compartments.

No doubt this isolation of the Apostolic Age, which probably had its ultimate origin in a dogmatic tradition, had more to be said for it even a generation ago than could be said to-day. It might at that time have been urged (though Dr. Sanday's own earliest writings made large gaps in the argument) that, as we knew a great deal more of the Christian history of the three-quarters of a century before A. D. 100 than of the three-quarters of a century after it, it was lost labour to try and illustrate the known by the unknown. But now the argument is out of date : the intervening years have contributed notably to our wider and more precise knowledge of the second century, whether in the fixing of the chronology, or in the vindication or rejection of documents already known, or in the acquisition of wholly new material. So much so, that some things even of what Dr. Sanday then said could no longer be said to-day.

For the chronology of the second century Dr. Sanday spoke (p. 15) of the date of Polycarp's martyrdom and the dates of Justin's *Apologies* and death as 'pivot-points'. On all of these a definite advance in precision can be recorded. The Letter of the Church of Smyrna, which is our authority, as it was the authority of the church historian Eusebius, for the martyrdom of Polycarp, relates that the saint, who had then been a Christian for eighty-six years, was martyred in the proconsulship of Quadratus, on a high sabbath, and on the 2nd of the month Xanthicus. These *data* were useless to Eusebius, who placed the martyrdom by conjecture

about the year 167: but they were employed with great skill by the French epigraphist and statesman, Waddington (1867, 1872), to recommend a much earlier date, Saturday, February 23, A. D. 155. Waddington's general results were unimpeachable, but he had given no explanation of the 'high' sabbath; moreover, we know that Polycarp visited Rome during the episcopate of Anicetus, and it was not easy to place Anicetus' accession before this same year 155 at earliest. My own first contribution to research¹ was the suggestion that the true date was Saturday, February 22, A. D. 156, and I think that that suggestion still holds the field.

With regard to Justin, the Acts of his Martyrdom are now universally regarded as authentic (they have their place in von Gebhardt's *Acta Martyrum Selecta*, 1902, p. 18), and the date of office of Rusticus, the 'praefectus Urbi' mentioned in them, is fixed to A. D. 163 at earliest, fifteen years after the date proposed by Hort.² This gives us the *terminus ad quem* for his writings: a new *terminus a quo* appears to be offered by the discovery of the date of the prefecture of L. Munatius Felix in Egypt (see Justin, *Apol.* i 29) as c. A. D. 151.³ Justin's writings thus fall later than used to be supposed, and both *Apologies* and *Dialogue* may now be safely placed in the sixth decade of the second century.

For the contrast of the newer state of our knowledge with the old is not simply that we have more documents, though we have, but that more precision has been attained, and the number of disputable points reduced, in the use of documents already familiar. Sometimes this will be by bringing down the supposed or traditional date: Justin's are not the only writings cited by Dr. Sanday in this section where the conventional

¹ In a paper read in Oxford on October 31, 1887, and printed in *Studia Biblica*, ii (1890), p. 105.

² In a paper (referred to by Dr. Sanday, p. 15) in the *Journal of Classical and Sacred Philology*, 1856.

³ *Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, ii (A. D. 1899), no. ccxxxvii, col. 8, ll. 18, 20.

ascriptions of early date have had to be curtailed. While in the main the genuineness and antiquity of the literature have been signally vindicated, some serious qualification would have to be made in regard both to the pseudo-Clementine *Homilies* (p. 8) and to the earliest list of canonical books called from its discoverer the Muratorian fragment (p. 14). Already in 1883 the older date for the fragment, c. A. D. 170, had been challenged, and I suppose it is now agreed that it should be assigned to quite the end of the second century. But with regard to the *Homilies* Dr. Sanday could still assume that proof that they used the Fourth Gospel was proof that the Fourth Gospel was older than A. D. 170. Since then the age and the credit of this whole cycle of Clementine literature has been steadily undermined: it belongs to the third century, and not necessarily to the early part of it.

If criticism, however, has thus reduced the bulk of the remains of the second-century literature, discovery has been no less busy than criticism, and its results are no less noteworthy. To the last generation a primitive literature of Church Orders simply did not exist: now we have the discovery of a Latin palimpsest at Verona which has led to the vindication for Hippolytus and the beginning of the third century of the so-called Egyptian Church Order,¹ and, most sensational of all recent *trouvailles*, the *Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*, published by Bryennios² in the very year of Dr. Sanday's lecture. In Armenian the lost treatise of St. Irenaeus *εἰς ἐπίδειξιν τοῦ ἀποστολικοῦ κηρύγματος* 'On the Apostolic Preaching' was issued, with notes by

¹ E. Hauler, *Didascaliae Apostolorum Fragmenta Veronensia Latina*, 1900; E. Schwartz, *Ueber die pseudo-apostolischen Kirchenordnungen*, 1910; R. H. Connolly, *The so-called Egyptian Church Order and Derived Documents* (*Texts and Studies*, viii. 4), 1916; and my own articles in the *Church Quarterly Review*, 1917, 1918.

² Philotheos Bryennios, *Διδαχὴ τῶν Δώδεκα Ἀποστόλων, νῦν πρῶτον ἐκδιδομένη*, Constantinople, 1883.

Harnack and a German translation, in 1907. In Syriac Rendel Harris has found for us the *Odes of Solomon* (1909) and the *Apology* of Aristides (1891): the latter is the earliest extant Christian Apology, and though the uncomfortable habit of the second-century emperors in adopting their predecessor's principal name makes it difficult to decide between the Hadrian and the Hadrian Antoninus which both occur in the address, it can hardly be later than A.D. 140; the former work, though by no means so early as some enthusiastic admirers have supposed, may nevertheless be reasonably placed within the limits of the second century.

Last in order let me cite what for the illustration of the canonical writings would be first in importance, the recovery in Egypt (1892) of substantial fragments of the Gospel and Apocalypse of Peter, the former as startling as the latter is dull. A writing is not necessarily interesting because it is primitive, nor has a forger necessarily much to say because he borrows an apostolic name to play with. Neither 2 Peter nor the Petrine Apocalypse raise our opinion of the intellectual standard of the circles which produced the more orthodox Christian *pseudepigrapha*, the Sunday afternoon literature of the ancient Church; the Gospel of Peter arrests our notice both because the author has a quite definitely heretical axe to grind—he is a Docetic Gnostic who tries to tell the story of the Crucifixion and Resurrection of a non-human Christ—and because his work contains the earliest known evidence for the existence and circulation of all four canonical Gospels. For proof that this pseudo-Petrine writer used each of the Gospels, St. John included, I must refer to an article of my own in the *Journal of Theological Studies* for January 1913, the argument of which I believe to be as unanswerable as it is unanswered. Of course, the significance of this Diatessaron, if we may so call it, of pseudo-Peter depends on his date; Professor Lake puts him 'between

100 and 135 A.D.'; I should be content with a somewhat lower estimate within the limits 115-140. Even so, it is the most crucial bit of evidence for the history of the Canon that the modern period has produced.

II

So far I have been speaking of the chronology and literature of the second Christian century as it provides and warrants the evidence for the use and authority of the New Testament Scriptures. I pass to the group of writings which lie themselves on the borderland of the Canon, the letters of Clement, Ignatius, Polycarp, and Barnabas, and the *Shepherd* of Hermas, familiar to us under the common heading of 'Apostolic Fathers'. Documents which at least sporadically were ranked with the New Testament itself—two complete copies of the New Testament have reached us from the first five centuries, and one of them, the Codex Alexandrinus, includes the genuine as well as a spurious epistle of St. Clement, the other, the Codex Sinaiticus, includes the epistle of Barnabas and the *Shepherd* of Hermas—could not be wholly left out of view, even if they were not also the earliest witnesses to the apostolic tradition.

Here the new material, if not sensational in extent or character, is again considerable. Of the Epistle of St. Clement to the church of Corinth we have now in print a Syriac version edited by Bensly (1899), a Latin version edited by Morin (1894), and an imperfect Coptic version edited by Carl Schmidt (1908). Of Hermas, on the other hand, it is our knowledge of the original Greek that has been reinforced, in one direction by Prof. Kirsopp Lake's photograph and transcript (Clarendon Press, 1907) of the Athos MS., our only Greek authority for most of the book, in another by the publication at Oxford and at Berlin of several papyrus fragments, too small in bulk to rank as a new witness to

the text, yet, owing to their age, of great value for testing the character of the late and corrupt Athos MS.¹

But the outstanding event of the period since 1883 is bishop Lightfoot's superb edition of Clement, Ignatius, and Polycarp, contained in five volumes, published three of them in 1885, the other two (posthumously) in 1890; the greatest contribution made to patristic learning in the last two centuries. The Ignatian controversy has now been set at rest: criticism has done its work, and the genuineness of the letters can never again be called in question.

Only on Hermas, among the sub-apostolic writers, is there crying need for work such as Lightfoot accomplished for Hermas' elder and greater fellows—greater, since no one can claim any intellectual or theological capacity in the worthy man, elder, since the attempt to set aside the clear external testimony which fixes the date of Hermas in the neighbourhood of A.D. 140 seems fortunately to have gone out of fashion. Some two years ago, moved by the appeal of Prof. Grenfell, I undertook—wisely or unwisely—the task of providing a new edition. And a new edition of the Greek means, in the first place, a new edition of the very ancient Latin version. I wish that I could successfully appeal to some younger scholar to aid me in the work and, it may be, to carry it to completion.

The result of this preliminary inquiry has been to show that the labours of the last generation have secured for us a body of the Christian literature of the second century better authenticated, more varied in character, more precisely fixed in time, than our predecessors had at their disposal. This body of literature

¹ For a list of them see my article on the *Shepherd of Hermas and the Problem of its Text* in the *Journal of Theological Studies* (1920), p. 202 n. To the Latin MSS enumerated on p. 205 I am now enabled (by the help of Dom de Bruyne, of Maredsous, who referred me to an article of J. Warichez in the *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique*, 1905, pp. 281 sqq.) to add MSS at Mons, Antwerp, Brussels, and Paris.

is at once the test and the foil of the literature of the New Testament.

III

Next after the history of the formation of the Canon Dr. Sanday placed 'what is commonly called Introduction'. Before, that is to say, we can profitably concentrate ourselves upon the study of the individual books or groups of books which make up the New Testament, there are certain broad avenues of approach which we ought first to explore. We need not lose ourselves in 'prolegomena to the prolegomena'; but still some general acquaintance with the New Testament in the largest sense should precede the minute investigation of the parts. For this purpose the history of the Apostolic Age and the chronology of the Apostolic Age must be constructed, tentatively no doubt and conditionally; upon the testimony of the documents as a whole. We cannot begin by ruling out part of the evidence: such assumptions as have to be made will verify or disprove themselves as we go on and as we find what elements are really irreconcilable with the rest.

Studies in the sphere of this preparatory discipline have occupied no small share of my own work in the past. On the chronology of the New Testament I wrote at length in the first volume of Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible* (1898), and, though I might want to make corrections in detail, I do not think my main conclusions have been shaken. This is at any rate true, I hope, of the second half of the article, on the chronology of the Epistles and the Acts. Only one important addition has, so far as I know, accrued in recent years¹ to the evidence. Among the obvious points of contact between St. Paul's missionary journeys and secular history, the proconsulship

¹ See Wohlenberg, *Eine Claudius-Inschrift von Delphi in ihrer Bedeutung für die paulinische Chronologie* (Neue Kirchliche Zeitschrift, 1912), and the literature there cited. I owe to Dr. Wohlenberg's kindness a copy of his article.

of Gallio in Achaia is one: and the words 'in Gallio's proconsulship' occur in the fragments of a votive inscription lately found at Delphi. The emperor named is Claudius: the years of his tribunician power and his consulship are unfortunately lost, but he was *αὐτοκράτωρ* *κς'*, that is Emperor XXVI. Now in an inscription which can be fixed to August 1, A.D. 52, Claudius is named Emperor XXVII, and in another which coincides with his eleventh year of tribunician power, January 25, A.D. 51-January 24, A.D. 52, he was Emperor XXII (XXIII) and XXIV. He was therefore acclaimed Emperor XXV and XXVI somewhere in the eighteen months between the beginning of A.D. 51 and the middle of 52; and as we may reasonably conclude that not more than the four acclamations XXII-XXV should be credited to the single year 51, the 26th acclamation will almost certainly fall in the first half of 52. If the inscription implies that Gallio was in office at the moment, then part of the twelve months of his proconsulship of Achaia fell in the same half-year. But as the proconsuls left Rome for their seat of government in the spring, his term of office may so far have been either from May 51 to May 52, or from May 52 to May 53, with some balance of probability (since otherwise both the 26th and 27th acclamations would fall within three months, May 1-August 1, 52) in favour of the first alternative. If, on the other hand, what is possible, though not likely, Gallio is only referred to on the inscription as a past proconsul, then the year 51-52 is the latest one possible for his term. My own date for St. Paul's eighteen months' stay at Corinth was the autumn of A.D. 50 to the spring of 52.

Chronology is to most of us the driest of the dry bones of History: but though the dry bones in the prophet's vision needed sinews and flesh and skin and breath before they could live, yet after all the dry bones were the substratum, and I am convinced that the

most necessary equipment for the historian, and especially for the historian of a period when the processes of developement and growth were so rapid as in the Apostolic Church, is to begin with a firm grasp of the chronological framework. With the mind once trained to be keenly sensitive to this side of history, intuition can sometimes almost take the place of argument: some suggestions and combinations even of the most eminent critics are felt and known to be impossible. I believe my own experience to be that I think out history in terms of chronology.

The history of the Early Church, the history of the Apostolic Age, has occupied during the last two generations the attention of some of the greatest among the theological scholars of France and Germany. Renan's seven volumes, *Histoire des origines du Christianisme*, Duchesne's *Histoire ancienne de l'Église*, and more German works than I have the knowledge to enumerate, evoke rather humbling thoughts in an English scholar. The little books we do, I dare say, well enough, and the little books are badly wanted: but there does not exist, to my knowledge,¹ in our own language, any history of the Christian Church either during the early centuries in general or during the first century in particular which can seriously challenge comparison with what has been done abroad—and yet Englishmen possess in a larger degree than other nations the political sense and the sanity of judgement which are among the best qualifications for the writing of history. At the back of my mind from a rather distant date has lain, often dormant but from time to time revived, the ambition to give my best energies to this task. At least a quarter of a century ago I accepted the invitation of my kind friend Septimus Rivington to publish on a modest scale a history of the ante-Nicene Church. In the intervening

¹ Dr. Nolloth's *Rise of the Christian Religion* (1917) is at once less and more than a History of the Apostolic Age.

years the scheme has enlarged itself in my conceptions, and I seem to see the right articulation of the subject in a series of volumes, of which the first should bear the title 'the Catholic Church', and deal with the evolution of the Christian society out of a Jewish sect into a universal communion; the second, under the heading 'the Apostolic Church', would treat of the process by which, under pressure from outside and especially from the rivalry of the various forms of Gnosticism, the instinct of Christians of the 'Great Church' as regards their faith, their sacraments, their scriptures, their ministry, was explicitly expressed with appeal to the apostolic tradition; the next, labelled 'the Holy Church', would describe the external growth of the body, and therewith its more complex relations with the pagan world and the consequent risk of a lowered standard of life, till one Puritan schism after another tried to find the holiness of the Church in its isolation; and perhaps a final volume on the triumph of the Church and the heavy price that was paid for it.

That was my vision of the best service I could aim at doing to the Church and to learning: it may never be more than a vision. But at least on the history of the Apostolic Age I have lectured regularly since my appointment six years ago as University Lecturer in the History and Literature of the Early Church, and I trust, all well, to return to the same subject in my professorial lectures next term, with the definite hope of some day developing the lectures into a book.

IV

When we pass to the New Testament documents by transition from the history of their time, the classification which imposes itself is that which groups them according to the date of writing. And if we take the Apostolic Age to be the period which elapses between Pentecost and the end of the first century, then the

historical books, Gospels and Acts with Apocalypse, fall into the later half, the Epistles, with really very little overlapping, into the earlier half of it; the years from the persecution of Nero to the fall of Jerusalem, A.D. 64-70, forming a sort of debateable land between the one half and the other.

Perhaps it would be most scientific to begin with the second half of the period, with the later documents, and to work back from them to the earlier: but the converse arrangement is easier to follow, and it is also, as it happens, more convenient, for it enables us to take a fixed starting-point in the Pauline Epistles and to work up to the Gospels, which in turn provide the problems where the higher or historical and literary criticism is essentially involved with the lower or textual criticism, a province in which I hope I may have some contribution to make.

Since Baur reduced the *corpus* of the Pauline Epistles to four, there has been a steady and continuous movement of rehabilitation. The Dutch professor van Manen denied indeed the genuineness of all, and thereby of course deprived himself of the most obvious test for questioning the genuineness of any: but you will not expect me to detain you in exposing the freaks of which criticism can be capable. Nine epistles may be said to rank, with whatever qualifications in detail, as genuine writings of St. Paul, nor can I myself admit that there is any case against the tenth, the epistle, so-called, to the Ephesians, once it is realised that that epistle is a theological pronouncement in the guise of a circular letter. More doubt hangs over the Pastoral Epistles, and there is certainly a problem here which may profitably occupy our serious attention. While we wait for the commentary which my honoured predecessor has had in hand for many years, and which the opportunity of his present post may we hope enable him to bring to completion, one may meanwhile emphasise

some general considerations of the sort that are perhaps liable to be overlooked. Critical acumen alone may so easily lead astray, if the historical sense is wanting. Even the evidence of vocabulary, taken by itself, may acquire disproportionate significance where the documents for comparison are no more than ten letters spread over some fifteen years. Take the case of St. Cyprian's correspondence: you have more than seventy letters, packed into less than nine years, and there are, besides, fragments of the contemporary correspondence of Cornelius of Rome and Dionysius of Alexandria: and contrast then the sparse remains of the Pauline literature with hardly any other documentary background than a few chapters of the book of Acts. Would not the wonder rather be if there were no holes to be picked, no ἀπορίαι to be raised?

It may be said that the fewer points of contact, the more difficult to demonstrate genuineness. Of course: but it is a fallacy to suppose that no document ought to be used in evidence until its genuineness is demonstrated. It cannot be too often repeated that the converse procedure is the true one to follow: the presumption is in favour of any document that does not, under historical criticism and literary analysis, reveal itself to be a forgery. It is really not so easy as some people seem to think to pass off counterfeit literature with permanent success. The fourth-century author of the pseudo-Clementine Constitutions and pseudo-Ignatian letters deceives no one nowadays. Very nearly as much can be said about the writer of the Second Epistle of St. Peter.

Now on historical grounds I do not think it is too much to say that the Pastoral Epistles offer no serious stumbling-blocks. Even without them there is good presumption for the release of St. Paul from his first imprisonment at Rome. Internal organisation, in a church which had experienced such intensive culture

as that of Ephesus, may well have developed as far as the stage implied in 1 Timothy. If there are differences of vocabulary, if there is in the writer a certain stiffness of mind which is not present in the Paul we know from the remaining epistles, is this hard to understand in a man whose nervous energy had had so many calls made on it and had spent itself in responding freely to them all? Read the catalogue of the apostle's experiences in 2 Cor. xi, add to them seven years of increasing age, anxieties, and infirmity, and you will surely realise that there might have come a time when even the magnificent vitality of St. Paul showed signs of giving out. At least you will realise it, I think, as you begin to get old yourselves.

I do not doubt that these Epistles, being more recent in date and addressed merely to individuals and not to churches, were incorporated into the collection of Pauline Epistles at a later stage than the rest. Their absence from the *Apostolicon* of Marcion (c. A.D. 140) I incline to explain, not by Marcion's having wilfully cut them out, but by his not possessing them in his own set of copies. Even as preserved in the Catholic canon, they may be thought to betray some signs, not so much of an editor as of an annotator whose remarks have found their way into the text: the repetition of the phrase *πιστὸς ὁ λόγος, πιστὸς ὁ λόγος καὶ πάσης ἀποδοχῆς ἅγιος*,¹ which seems extraordinarily alien from the style of any St. Paul we can picture to ourselves, I should like to attribute to the marginal note of an appreciative reader, 'very true', 'very true, as every one must agree'.

But it is perhaps not so much in any criticism of documents, or in any commentary—not even in the great commentary on the Romans of which I have spoken—that the greatest revolution in our conception of St. Paul's history has been brought about. It is sometimes difficult to persuade oneself that Dr. Sanday's

¹ 1 Tim. i 15; iii 1; iv 9; 2 Tim. ii 11; Tit. iii 8.

entry on office and one's own commencement of study in theology ante-dated by some ten years the emergence of what we call the South-Galatian theory—so completely has this theory become a commonplace of our historical criticism. Sir William Ramsay was not the first scholar to suggest that the Galatians to whom St. Paul preached, and whose defection caused him such acute distress and indignation, were not Galatae, Gauls or Celts of ethnic Galatia, but the converts of the first missionary journey recorded in the Acts, inhabitants of Pisidian Antioch, Iconium, Lystra, Derbe, all of them towns which belonged to Galatia in its wider political extension: nevertheless it was he who marshalled the scattered *data* into a coherent whole, brought up argument after argument in support, and finally swept the opposing theory from the field.¹

To have abolished two putative journeys of the apostle to northern Galatia, for which room could only with great difficulty be found in the *cadre* of Acts, is by itself an immense simplification of the history: and to show that St. Luke has described in detail the preaching to the 'Galatians' is to raise the credit of St. Luke's work, from the point of view of proportion, on a very material issue, since otherwise the historian would have passed over in silence what cannot have been a mere episode in St. Paul's career. But I proceed to invite your attention to the resultant indications of the date of the Galatian epistle.

The older generation among us were brought up to believe in four distinct groups of Pauline Epistles, of which the epistles dealing with the problem of Jewish and Gentile Christianity made up the second. And within this group Galatians, which in subject-matter most resembles Romans, had to be placed next to it—after the two Corinthian epistles, if before the Roman—

¹ *Church in the Roman Empire*, 1893: and *passim* since.

and the conclusion was further commended because it put the epistle in the proper position of posteriority to the two supposed visits to 'Galatia' of Acts xvi 6 and xviii 23. But on the South-Galatian view there were *ex hypothesi* much earlier visits to 'Galatian' churches: Acts xiii 14 to xiv 20 on the outward half of the first missionary journey, Acts xiv 21 on the return, Acts xvi 1-4 at the outset of the second journey. The way is thus open for an earlier dating of the epistle than before: and an earlier dating has much in its favour. Most emphatically should I wish to record my dissent from the assumption that two epistles related in subject must necessarily be related also in time. If St. Paul had, at an early stage of his developement, hammered out certain chains of reasoning in connexion with the claim for Gentile Christianity of emancipation from the rules of Judaism, and if this claim was insistently before him during the greater part of his apostleship, how in the world can the recurrence in both the Galatian and Roman letters of the themes Law, Circumcision, the Faith of Abraham, prove anything more than common authorship? And, on the other side, there would be clear gain, where tone and temper of two documents differ so fundamentally, if we could allow a somewhat wide interval between them, an interval as between the heated and one-sided advocacy of a cause whose fortune lay in the balance, and its temperate and judicial exposition when the verdict had been won and the worst of the struggle lay already in the past.

The date of the Roman epistle is fixed: it was written from Corinth in the winter of A.D. 55-56: the uncertain factor is the date of Galatians. What is its relation to Acts and to the Apostolic Council of A.D. 49? I have always felt sure that the mission of the 'certain persons from Judaea' to Antioch in Acts xv 1 and the mission of the 'certain persons from James' in Gal. ii 12 are one and the same thing, and that the vacillation of St. Peter

preceded the settlement arrived at by the Council. But I used to suppose, with Zahn and St. Augustine, that while the visit to Jerusalem of Gal. ii 1-10 was the visit to the Council of Acts xv, yet in Gal. ii 11 ff. St. Paul, by a possible, though not the most obvious, interpretation, was harking back to an earlier moment. And I cannot doubt that if the epistle was written after the Council, the Council must be the subject of the preceding verses: St. Paul could not conceivably have avoided mentioning it, *unless the epistle was written before the Council*. And this is what I have come to suspect may be the true solution. If the mission from Jerusalem, flushed with its success at Antioch, had gone on to Galatia and there weaned the Galatian Christians from their allegiance, we can better understand the apostle's hot anger against this 'quick-change' performance, οὕτω ταχέως μετατίθεσθε (Gal. i 6), seeing that only a few months had passed since he left them. On this showing the epistle was written early in A.D. 49, and is the first of all his extant epistles.

From the Pauline Epistles we pass naturally to the two documents of the New Testament that are most nearly connected with them, the one through literary dependence, the other by external attribution. Both 1 Peter and Hebrews date themselves by their innate fitness for a particular moment. They belong to the border years between the period of the Pauline Epistles and the period of the Canonical Gospels, when Nero was making Christianity for the first time a capital offence, and the Jewish revolt was bringing the long story of centralised Judaism to its catastrophic close. No minor objection, no difficulties of detail, can stand for a moment, so I am convinced, against the broad historical probabilities of the situation. The Apostle Peter splendidly inaugurated the tale of the literature of the persecutions, when he sent to the communities of the Christian dis-

persion of Asia Minor his letter of encouragement under the stress of the first official attack by the Roman authorities upon the Christian name. Less than a couple of years later the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews calls on the Christians of the Holy City to jettison their traditions and their patriotism, the service of the Temple and the polity of the nation, and to find in Christ and His religion their sole and supreme satisfaction. To the Jew it was 'my country, right or wrong': the Christian was to bear the reproach of pacifism, to abandon the city and seek Christ 'without the gate'. As we know, the Christian community of Jerusalem followed his advice, and by their flight to Pella opened up a new era in the history of the Church.

V

Another book of the New Testament, the Revelation of St. John the Divine, was confidently dated by the scholars of the last generation in the same critical years of bewilderment and change. Renan's historical sense did not mislead him when he gave his fourth volume the title of *L'Antéchrist*, and saw in the expectation of Nero's return a central thought of the Apocalypse. But it is now recognised both that the expectation remained vivid and active over a number of years, and also that there are features of the book which suit better a later developement of the tension between Church and world, and suggest rather the days of Domitian than of Nero. With some of these historical relationships I tried to deal in an article since reprinted in my *Studies in Early Church History*.¹ But if the Domitianic date (the tradition of which goes back as far as St. Irenaeus) is now by general consent substituted, criticism has been busy instead over the internal analysis of the book, and it

¹ Oxford, 1912, pp. 189-219, 'St. John in Asia Minor: the Apocalypse' (from the *Church Quarterly Review*, January 1894).

has become the mode to distinguish in it strata or layers of various age and diverse origin. Apocalyptic literature in general is peculiarly exposed to successive re-handling, and nobody disputes the composite origin, for instance, of the book of Enoch. It jumps to sight, as the French say, that the canonical Apocalypse is saturated through and through with the language of the great prophetic and apocalyptic writers of the past. Nevertheless, it is an extraordinarily fascinating piece of literature (far more so than most of its congeners of the same type), and I could not easily believe that it did not come red-hot from the imagination of a single writer. I am the more glad to see that Dr. Charles, whose long looked for volumes on the Apocalypse have just become available, asserts the substantial unity of the book, because I confess that I have been sceptical of the success of the dissecting processes applied by him to other apocalyptic writings. But it would not be respectful to so distinguished a scholar, without a prolonged study and assimilation of the contents of his *Commentary*, to do more here than call attention to its appearance.

In a sense the Apocalypse may be called a by-product of the Apostolic Church. If its canonical rank was never doubted in the West, it was cold-shouldered by the Greek Fathers: we cannot tell whether it was ever contained in the Vatican manuscript, and it never gained admission into the Syriac New Testament. Critical questions concerning it are not crucial to the history of Christian origins, as they are in regard to the one book of which it remains to speak before we approach the Gospels.

The book of Acts presents perhaps more opportunities for the application to it of literary and historical tests than any other in the New Testament. Are the 'We' passages, where at three or four points in the latter half of the book the narrative is suddenly switched on to the first person plural, the genuine diary of a

travelling-companion of St. Paul, and if so are they from the same hand as the rest of the book? Do the numerous references to the political status of different towns and provinces suggest an accurate observer and a contemporary, or the reverse? Is the record of St. Paul's missionary work as given in Acts borne out, or no, by the indications of the apostle's own letters? And does the picture of the developement of Christianity, during the early period for which other authorities are lacking, account sufficiently and reasonably for the known factors of the case?

On each and all of these issues the critics of the first half of the Victorian Age were accustomed to condemn the writer almost unheard. To the Tübingen school the book of Acts was the most typical embodiment of the spirit of reconciliation, at the moment of its triumph over what they conceived to be the internecine quarrels of the Apostolic Age. If St. Peter and St. Paul were never on speaking terms, it was obvious that the compiler of the Acts described events not as they were, but as he thought that they ought to have been; he may have written as late as the middle of the second century, when the Catholic synthesis was dominant and had passed a clean sponge over the memory of all earlier conflicts.

The theory was extraordinarily ingenious, the presentation of it was very able; but it had regard only to a small proportion of the facts. Already, before 1883, Renan had declared for the Lucan authorship, and for the homogeneity of the 'We' passages with the rest of the book. Lightfoot had begun, what Ramsay has ably and persistently carried on, the demonstration of the historical accuracy of the setting. The redressing of the balance in favour of the author of Acts, which Dr. Sanday hoped to undertake, 'extenuating nothing, but still less setting down aught in malice' (p. 35), has been during the last generation steadily pushed forward

towards accomplishment. Harnack's whole-hearted conversion represents the new attitude of the German 'Left Centre'. I could not go so far as some conservative critics are wont to do in asserting the writer's immunity from mistakes, and for all I know he may have borrowed from Josephus: but to me it is beyond dispute that Luke, the disciple and companion of St. Paul, is the one and only author of the book, 'We' passages and all, and that it was therefore published some time between the limits A. D. 60 and 100.

Of course this agreement as to authorship carries us only a certain way. There are many other problems that remain over for discussion, and with some of them I hope it may still be possible for me to deal. My earliest New Testament studies were connected with the book: in the course of an essay submitted (unsuccessfully) for the Ellerton Prize in 1886 I examined minutely the language of the first few verses of the first 'We' passage (Acts xvi 10 ff.) with reference to the language used by St. Luke elsewhere; and I think that that examination may even challenge comparison with the similar tables made by Harnack in his treatise 'Luke the Physician'.¹ Much later, but still many years ago, I was invited to undertake the book for the *International Critical Commentary*, and gave a partial assent on condition that I might share the task with a colleague. It must be admitted that the work has languished, but I hope that it may now receive fresh impetus, should my colleague, as I anticipate, find in the immediate future a position of increased leisure and greater opportunity for research.² The division of labour between us was to proceed roughly on the lines that, while of course there would be mutual counsel and mutual revision through-

¹ *Lukas der Arzt*, 1906, pp. 28-46.

² [The appointment of the Rev. H. N. Bate to a canonry in Carlisle Cathedral is now officially announced.]

out, my colleague should be responsible for the exegesis and I myself for the introduction and the text.

On three heads of the subject-matter that would fall within my share I should like to say something now: on the date of the book, on its text, and (very briefly) on the picture of the history presented in the first twelve chapters.

1. Of late years more than one competent scholar has proposed—so far has the momentum of reaction carried us—to date the Acts at the moment to which the history in it is brought down, that is, at the end of two years of imprisonment of St. Paul at Rome.¹ It is thought that the present close of the book leaves us, on any supposition except that that was the moment of writing, too much in the air: we want to know what is going to happen, and whether the apostle was released or no: the *finis* lacks dramatic fitness. Now if St. Luke's Gospel was written after A.D. 70, and the Acts after the Gospel (and I still regard both of these conclusions as infinitely more likely than not), what answer can we make to the objection? Well, in the first place we might say that St. Luke intentionally broke off his history before he arrived at the first commencements of the clash between the Empire and Christianity: yet if St. Paul was released from this first imprisonment, his release would have formed a better climax than his two years' imprisonment to the narrative of pacific relations between Church and State. Or we might, with more plausibility, suggest that St. Paul's release, and his subsequent travels West and East, and his re-arrest, and his martyrdom, and St. Peter's martyrdom, were to form the subject-matter of a third historical work, completing the Lucan trilogy, which for some unknown reason was never brought to birth: and this suggestion has some

¹ R. B. Rackham, 'The Acts of the Apostles: a plea for an early date', in *J. T. S.* i (October 1899), p. 76; A. Harnack, *Die Apostelgeschichte* (1908), p. 217.

support lent to it by the language in which the Muratorian Canon follows up its mention of the Acts with the mysterious phrase 'sicuti et semote passionem Petri evidenter declarat sed et profectionem Pauli ab Urbe ad Spaniam proficiscentis'. But in fact the true explanation is, as I believe, something quite different. I believe that the Gospel and Acts form the two halves of a simple and connected scheme, and that in order to understand it we have only to attach to the two books some such labels as these: *Λόγος α'*, 'How Jesus the Christ preached the Good News to the Jews, and how after His Death and Resurrection He commissioned His Apostles to preach it to the Gentiles': *Λόγος β'*, 'How they brought the Good News from Jerusalem to Rome'. With the two years' unhindered proclamation of the Kingdom in the capital of the world, the evolution of the Jewish Christian sect into the Universal Church was symbolically accomplished.

2. On the problem of New Testament text I am touching at a later point; and therefore I will say only one word here in reference to the Bezan recension of the Acts. I had always wished to grapple with this thorny question, and Dr. Sanday took it, not many years back, as the subject for our Seminar: we came, I need not tell you, to no conclusion, but I am bound to record the impression received, that there was more to be said than perhaps we had supposed for the originality of the readings presented in the Codex Bezae. In regard to one of them, historically I suppose the most important of them all, namely the text of the Apostolic Decree in Acts xv 20, 28, I am led for my own part more and more to the conviction that D (with Irenaeus, Cyprian, &c.) must be right in omitting the words 'things strangled', and in thereby placing the prescriptions of the Council, 'idolatry, bloodshed, unchastity,' on a moral instead of on a ritual basis.

3. But the storm-centre of present-day criticism of the

Acts is St. Luke's description of the history and development of belief and practice in primitive Christianity down to the time of the Apostolic Council. Had St. Luke the materials necessary for a truthful picture, and if he had, did he use them truthfully? These and the like questions are being raised and will be raised, for instance, in the comprehensive volumes of which Professors Lake and Foakes-Jackson have just issued their first instalment.¹ To such questions I take the one and only adequate answer to be on the principle of *solvitur ambulando*. Try to see what St. Luke really does tell us of the successive emergence of the problems that faced the apostolic Church, and of the manner in which they were met. Does his story satisfactorily bridge the gap between the first beginnings and St. Paul? If it does not, *cadit quaestio*. If it does, we have solved the difficulty *ambulando*. And the strange thing is, I know of no one who has seriously and successfully set himself to see how, according to St. Luke's presentation, the situation develops step by step from the elementary principles of the infant church of Pentecost, past the tentative advances of the Seven, to St. Peter's reluctant action in the case of Cornelius and St. Paul's more drastic action at Pisidian Antioch, till we reach the final vindication of Gentile liberty at the Council of Jerusalem. I do not say that from the same beginning development must have moved by this route and no other to the same ending: but I do say that St. Luke has given us a rational, articulated, and satisfactory account, which has every claim to be regarded as an honest and faithful attempt to picture things as they really happened.

¹ *The Beginnings of Christianity: Part I. The Acts of the Apostles.* Edited by F. J. Foakes-Jackson, D.D., and Kirsopp Lake, D.D. Vol. I: Prolegomena I, The Jewish, Gentile, and Christian Backgrounds. Macmillans, 1920.

PART II

VI

AN outline has so far been given of the work that has been done during the last thirty-seven years, or is doing now, upon the Christian literature of the second century, upon Introduction, upon the New Testament books other than the Gospels: there is left over for to-day¹ the criticism of the Gospels and the problems of the New Testament text. But the criticism of the Gospels might occupy a course by itself, and if I am to say anything worth saying about parts of the inquiry I must be very brief and summary in my treatment of the remainder. In discriminating for this purpose, it happens that Dr. Sanday, in the latter half of the period under discussion—indeed, if one takes into account the comparative suspension of critical activity during the war, one might almost phrase it ‘towards the end of the period’—dealt in two successive books with two of the main topics of investigation, *The Criticism of the Fourth Gospel* (1905) and *The Life of Christ in Recent Research* (1907), published respectively twenty-two and twenty-four years after his Inaugural Lecture. And I shall be content to skim the surface of these two subjects in a rather hasty review.

If the vindication of the book of Acts represents the chief achievement for the modern period of conservative reaction, the Fourth Gospel is undoubtedly the book, out of the whole New Testament, in regard

¹ October 29, 1920.

to which during the same epoch criticism has succeeded in effecting among us the most serious breaches in the bulwarks of tradition. Not long ago there could have been at home, whatever was the case abroad, no comparison between the respective calibre of the batteries of attack and defence. Sanday's own *primitiae*, the *Authorship and Historical Character of the Fourth Gospel* (1872); Westcott's edition of St. John in the *Speaker's Commentary* (1880); Archdeacon Watkins' Bampton Lectures, *Modern Criticism and the Fourth Gospel* (1890); Drummond's *Character and Authorship of the Fourth Gospel* (1903); Stanton's *Gospels as Historical Documents* (part i, 1903)—make up between them a firmly knit catena: and Sanday himself returned to the subject in the lectures, delivered in America in the autumn of 1904 and repeated in Oxford early in 1905, which he published under the title *The Criticism of the Fourth Gospel*. He was then in the zenith of his powers: we, the audience, hung on his lips, one might almost say, spell-bound: in some ways I think he never did better, he certainly never did more characteristic, pieces of work than in these and in the next published lectures. Probably he reached at this point the high-water mark of his cautious conservatism: his searching examination of the attacks made on the Fourth Gospel by foreign critics was damaging and (for him) mordant. Yet if it is quite unjust, it is also not altogether surprising that a profound religious philosopher of our own day should single out this very book as an example of confused thinking,¹ for Sanday did not really make up his mind as between the claims of the Apostle John and of another John, not the Apostle, to be the author of the Fourth Gospel. But it was just this reluctance to declare him-

¹ So too a distinguished Oxford representative of the school of 'liberal' theology expressed disappointment, on his return from listening to Sanday's Inaugural Lecture, at its inadequate grasp. Both expected from Sanday something that he would have disclaimed any intention of supplying.

self beyond where he saw clearly, that gave him his unique hold as a critic on people's confidence.

The years which have passed since those lectures were delivered and published have left their impress upon English thought, and upon Sanday himself, at no point more clearly than in the attitude adopted about the Fourth Gospel. What fifteen years ago was the predominant view among continental scholars is now I suppose almost the predominant view at home also. On what hypothesis Sanday finally fixed himself, or indeed if he fixed himself on any, I am not sure: but he had, I think, definitely moved away from belief in the apostolic authorship, and refused to allow his early book on the Fourth Gospel to be republished on the ground that its standpoint no longer commended itself to him. Nor can I deny that I am myself influenced in a similar direction—whether by contemporary atmosphere or contemporary arguments it is not always possible to say. Nowhere in the problems and moot questions of the Apostolic Age do external and internal evidence seem to provide so conflicting a report: and where that is so, it is wise to avoid the language of dogmatic decision. On the one hand, I have never faltered in the conviction that the testimony of an eye-witness lies behind this Gospel, for I doubt any man's capacity for inventing such individual details as distinguish St. Mark's Gospel and St. John's from the other two—and when we are asked to believe in three or four literary geniuses among the New Testament writers, all gifted with this remarkable capacity for clothing their inventions in the apparent garb of truth, our common sense revolts. On the other hand, I feel increasingly the difficulty of bringing the whole of the Gospel into relationship with the fisherman of Galilee, and take refuge provisionally in the hypothesis that John of Ephesus, the beloved disciple, was a youthful follower of our Lord at Jerusalem, to whom His Jerusalem

ministry would have been specially familiar,¹ whose house was there, whose acquaintances lay in the circle of the Sanhedrists and the high priests, and whose education, however profoundly Jewish, partook of the wider Greek culture accessible at the capital.

The other book of Dr. Sanday's to which I have referred, *The Life of Christ in Recent Research*, appeared in 1907, and the core of it is contained in the chapters entitled 'Twenty Years of Research', describing the history and progress of the interpretation of the Synoptic Gospels in Germany during the years which had passed since his return to Oxford as Professor. The outstanding feature of this period was the rise and rapid growth in popularity of an apocalyptic or eschatological conception of our Lord's teaching; and the outstanding book was *Von Reimarus zu Wrede* (in the English version, *The Quest of the Historical Jesus*), 1906, the summary of a hundred years of Gospel criticism by a thoroughgoing adherent of the new school, Albert Schweitzer.

These lectures of Sanday's seem to me to reach the very height and culmination of his special gifts, his wide reading, his careful delineation, his sympathetic criticism, with (what is not present in all his writings) a capacity to draw definite conclusions from the material before him. Nowhere I think will you find a juster estimate at once of the real value, and of the dangers and pitfalls, that belong to the apocalyptic interpretation of the Gospels: nowhere a judgement more sensitive to the merits, and at the same time perhaps more alive than in previous years to the failings, of German theological scholarship.

To Sanday's discriminating and penetrating verdict upon the eschatological school I could whole-heartedly

¹ The argument for our Lord's ministry at Jerusalem, as implied by the Synoptic account and necessary to complete it, is forcibly stated in Dr. Holland's *Philosophy of Faith* &c. (1920), pp. 128-34, 153-5.

subscribe: so far as my own opinion goes, it said exactly what was wanted: but I was always conscious of some reserve with regard to his over-dependence, as I thought it, on German criticism and German critics. With the profoundest admiration for their industry, their erudition, their courageous grasp of great undertakings, went the feeling that too much of their work was lacking in certain essential qualities of proportion and insight and historical sense: one could not wholly dissociate their activities in the field of theology from their activities in the field of politics, and if they understood no more of the mentality of Jew and Gentile in the Apostolic Age than they did of that of the peoples of Europe to-day, the validity of their conceptions would be at a heavy discount. And there are directions in which I have always thought that the best English and the best French work—for I have been an advocate of the *Entente* during the last thirty years—have no rivals.

Nevertheless, the danger to-day is that the scales may be over-weighted against the other side. It is the moment for generosity on the part of English scholars in their recognition of German work: and the experience of South Africa has taught us that the ventures of a generous faith are well and wisely risked. Not only is learning by its very essence cosmopolitan, but learning with the contribution of Germany deducted would be a very shadow of itself. Who can conceive the study of the Roman Empire without Mommsen, of the origins of palaeography without Traube, of early Canon Law without Maassen, or of the literature of Christian antiquity without Harnack?

VII

The Synoptic problem was given the place of honour in Dr. Sanday's enumeration of the chief heads that would demand discussion in any fresh Introduction to the New Testament: and he devotes eight pages

(pp. 20-8) to a sketch of the history of the problem and of its position at the time of his Lecture. In 1883 hardly any result of first-class importance had been made good. He could not at that time venture to say more than that the labour expended had not been in vain. But he pointed out the directions in which the inquiries already carried out seemed to promise most success; and if a real measure of agreement upon all the preliminary stages of the problem has now been reached, that is due in no small part to Dr. Sanday himself and to the unremitting zeal of those who worked under his guidance.

As between the relative importance of oral and documentary tradition in the formation of our Gospels, Sanday had to admit that, though the documentary theory had an almost exclusive vogue in Germany, the oral theory had the greater following in England. He did not conceal his own leaning to the German view; but with characteristic caution he 'doubted whether' German writers had of late 'quite done justice to its opposite'. To-day there is not, I suppose, a competent critic anywhere who assigns anything but a quite subordinate part to oral tradition. Possibly Westcott's continued championship of the oral hypothesis may have been among the things which led Sanday in his address on Edwin Hatch, a few weeks before his death, to utter so unusually trenchant an opinion about the *Introduction to the Study of the Gospels*. But Sanday not only followed Holtzmann and Weiss in the conclusion that a close literary analysis was the only hopeful avenue of approach to the problem; by a sound instinct he could already assert with them that this analysis inevitably led up to the Gospel according to St. Mark as the nearest representative of the original tradition. Certainly we ought not to be too harsh in our judgement upon the Tübingen critics for taking their start from the Gospel of St. Matthew—the real *gravamen* is that they were

influenced by *a priori* dogmatic considerations in doing so—seeing that they were only following the nearly unbroken custom of seventeen Christian centuries. But if the ablest critics in Germany and in England had already in 1883 seen that the *relative* priority of St. Mark to the other two Synoptists was quite incontestable, they were still in bondage, as much as the oralists, to the idea of a common tradition that lay behind all existing Gospels, St. Mark as well as the rest. Sanday himself divined the truth when he wrote that ‘St. Mark supplies the foundation of the Synoptic literature’ (p. 25): yet five pages before he had said that ‘there is at the present time a general consent that the resemblances in the Gospels are not due to direct copying or adaptation of each other, but to the employment in all of some common source or sources’.¹ And Dr. Edwin Abbott, whose *Common Tradition of the Synoptic Gospels* (1884) was my own first introduction to the scientific study of the problem, said no more about the alternative of Matthew and Luke copying Mark than that ‘that hypothesis must be dismissed’ (p. vii).

The hypothesis that Matthew and Luke had before them not our St. Mark but an earlier document very like it—not ‘Marcus’ but ‘Ur-Marcus’, according to the convenient terminology of the Germans—is obviously a less simple hypothesis than that their source was just the Mark we know: and so far it would always have been to my mind less probable. I have an incurable preference for simple solutions of literary problems²: experience seems to teach one that if 99 per cent. of the evidence points one way, the remaining

¹ An opposite confusion in expression lies behind his language in *Studies in the Synoptic Problem*, p. 9, where ‘the priority of St. Mark’ is made equivalent to ‘our St. Mark actually lay before the authors of the First and Third Gospels’.

² So too Sanday, *Studies*, p. 26: ‘the suggestions made in this essay are all very simple. It is just their simplicity which has had the chief attraction for me.’

1 per cent. may safely be disregarded—there is some explanation to be found, even if with the knowledge yet available we cannot find it. And by slower but of course more conclusive processes the vast majority of critics have by now arrived at the result which was regarded only a generation ago as beyond the pale of argument.

What then were the obstacles which veiled the truth for so long from the insight of inquirers? In the first place, there were the so-called doublets in the Second Gospel. If St. Mark wrote 'It having become late, at the time when the sun set' (i 32), and if, out of this double statement, we find one half 'it having become late' in the parallel passage in St. Matthew (viii 16), and the other half 'as the sun was setting' in the parallel passage in St. Luke (iv 40), the *prima facie* explanation would be that St. Mark was combining into one two earlier and independent narratives. And so, similarly, where St. Mark, ten verses later, has 'the leprosy departed from him and he was cleansed', Matthew has only 'his leprosy was cleansed' (viii 3), and Luke only 'the leprosy departed from him' (v 13): or, again, 'to-day in this night' of Mc. xiv 30 is parallel with 'to-day' of Lc. xxii 34 and 'in this night' of Mt. xxvi 34. But this *prima facie* probability quite evaporates when we find that such duplicate or pleonastic expressions are throughout characteristic of St. Mark, and that only in a mere handful of cases will the suggestion that one limb of the phrase is borrowed from St. Matthew, the other from St. Luke, account for the facts. For sometimes the double phrase is found both in St. Mark and St. Matthew, not in St. Luke (Mc. iv 5; iv 40; xiii 28; xiii 29); sometimes both in St. Mark and St. Luke, not in St. Matthew (Mc. ii 20; iv 39; vi 36; xiv 1); sometimes in St. Mark alone, St. Matthew and St. Luke using only one, but that the same, half of the phrase (Mc. ii 25; iii 26; x 22; xii 14; xiv 68). The one

feature that is constant throughout is the fondness of St. Mark for redundancies of expression ; redundancies which it is quite easy to suppose that the other Synoptists sometimes accepted, sometimes pruned away.

But a much more serious stumbling-block to the successful advance of the inquiry was the existence or supposed existence of agreements of St. Matthew and St. Luke against St. Mark. There is not much difficulty in accounting for such agreements so long as they are only *negative*, so long (that is) as they are agreements of St. Matthew and St. Luke in omitting words or phrases which we find in St. Mark : Sir John Hawkins (*Horae Synopticae*², 1909, pp. 117-52) has drawn out excellently a dozen reasons which may have moved the two other Synoptists to omit or alter this or that peculiar feature of the Gospel that was, as we now suppose, their exemplar. I should like to add one more to his category, because I think even Sir John Hawkins has failed to divine the inwardness of certain variations between the Synoptists. A peculiarity of St. Mark—less likely perhaps to strike a modern reader, because we should see in such details a natural feature of first-hand narrative, but somewhat repugnant to the conception, in a rhetorical age, of the dignity of history—is his fondness for precision in numbers. On some twelve occasions, numerals—they range from two to two thousand—noted by him are omitted by the other Synoptists ; and since this may be called a standing distinction between them and St. Mark, I demur to the inclusion of three of such cases in Sir John's list (p. 152) of the nine instances (he finds no more) cited as possible evidence of a later editor's hand in our Second Gospel.

It is another thing when these agreements are *positive* agreements, that is to say, when Matthew and Luke not only agree in altering St. Mark's word or phrase, but agree also in what they substitute for it. The number of such agreements is at first sight impressive :

and those who assert that for the matter common to all three Synoptists St. Mark is the source of the other two, have of course to give some explanation of what looks like a fatal bar to their claim.

Now the explanation that covers the large majority of cases is nothing but this. St. Mark's Gospel is a simple naïve and archaic piece of writing, achieving indeed (it may be said) a very high art by its want of art, but violating all the then accepted canons of literature : and when two other writers set themselves to incorporate its matter while improving its manner, the particular changes which a sense either of form or of language would suggest to two contemporary writers could hardly help being in many cases identical. Thus St. Mark's most characteristic mannerism is the use of the historic present, especially in the phrase 'He says': the most obvious correction for evangelists to whom the life of Christ was already removed by more than a generation of time was to substitute 'He said', and on a dozen occasions Matthew and Luke agree in doing so. But then there are half a dozen further instances where Luke also alters to the past tense, but Matthew keeps the present of Mark ; and instances again where both alter but make different alterations. Another non-literary habit of St. Mark is to begin his new paragraphs with the conjunction *καί*, while Greek usage regularly for this purpose prefers *δέ* : in twenty-six cases both the other Synoptists substitute *δέ*, but Luke again goes farthert han Matthew in his revision. And on more occasions than one might think the same solution will hold. If two Greek writers find a word or phrase in their common exemplar repugnant to their taste, and wish to change without more change than the necessary minimum, the chance that they may independently hit upon the same alternative is really not inconsiderable. Remember that we have to relate the number of agreements between Matthew and Luke where they

modify Mark to the *total number* of their modifications. Even a dozen agreements have a serious look if set by themselves : but if there are fifty or a hundred cases, the fact that in twelve of them the modifications made are identical ceases to have at all the same importance.

Nevertheless it need not be argued, and I think it could not be successfully argued, that all agreements between Matthew and Luke against Mark are accidental. For there are still other considerations to be offered which will further reduce the residue of unexplained agreement : and one in particular should be mentioned here. It is, of course, well known that there is a good deal of agreement, some of it exceedingly close, between Matthew and Luke, in passages which have nothing at all to correspond in Mark : and for this dual tradition, as it is called, another common source is postulated which is conventionally known as Q. The matter traceable to this source does not extend to the Passion narrative, and even for the Ministry it is concerned rather with our Lord's teaching than with His works : it is a Gospel of the Words of Christ, and therefore some scholars have not unnaturally connected it with that 'putting together of the Logia', τὰ λόγια συνεγράψατο, which Papias ascribed to St. Matthew. Now, if we have two documents about our Lord, even though one of them was primarily a collection of His discourses, and the other rather an outline of His public life, it would in any case be natural that here and there the matter of the one should overlap the matter of the other. In such cases of overlapping Matthew and Luke would have both sources to draw upon, and under the circumstances it is exactly what we should expect if, even though their main dependence is on Mark, they should be liable to modify or amplify his account from the account of Q, and that from time to time their modifications or amplifications should coincide. And this conclusion is independent of the

answer we give to the question whether or no St. Mark himself was acquainted with and influenced by Q, a question on which experts still take different sides. Mr. Streeter and Dr. Sanday answer in the affirmative: Professor Burkitt, if I understand him rightly, in the negative.¹ If Q came into existence at a quite early date as a sort of manual for converts of the ethical basis of Christian life, recollections of it would lie naturally at the back of St. Mark's mind (or of St. Peter's before him) in the composition of what was, I do not doubt, the first Life of our Lord to be written.

The two explanations so far given cover nearly, but not quite, the whole ground. There is still a residuum of agreements that cannot all of them, it would seem, be accounted for; and in the view both of Dr. Sanday and of Sir John Hawkins² they are numerous enough and cogent enough to suggest that Matthew and Luke had before them 'a recension of the text of Mark different from that from which all the extant MSS of the [latter] Gospel are derived'.

That is a conclusion to which I should come very reluctantly. A post-Markan 'recension' is open to the same sort of objections as a pre-Markan 'Ur-Marcus': in deference to 1 per cent. of the evidence it introduces a new factor, of the existence of which we have, otherwise, not the slightest indication. I should be much more inclined to adopt, if it were necessary, the simpler hypothesis that St. Luke had, at a late stage of the composition of his own Gospel, come across the Gospel according to St. Matthew, and had introduced from it a new touch here and there. But where the instances cited amount cumulatively to so little—Sir John Hawkins only puts together (a) nine instances on p. 152, where the hand of a later editor may perhaps be

¹ *Studies in the Synoptic Problem*, pp. 166-78, pp. xvi, xvii; *Gospel History and its Transmission*, p. 64.

² *Studies, &c.*, p. 21; *Horae Synopticae*², p. 212.

traced in St. Mark, and (b) twenty or twenty-one instances on pp. 210, 211, where the concurrences between Matthew and Luke seem to be beyond any possible range of chance¹—they must be rigorously tested, as Burkitt, for instance, has tested the second list (*Gospel History*, pp. 42–58), and in the assay many of them turn out to be counterfeit coin.

Thus Mark calls Herod Antipas 'King Herod' (vi 14), and possibly the title was used by the hangers-on of the princeling's court: Matthew and Luke both knew that in law he was no king at all but a tetrarch, and both substitute the correct term. Mark writes 'O faithless generation' (ix. 19), where both Matthew and Luke assimilate to a familiar phrase in Deuteronomy 'O faithless and perverse generation'. And the same explanation of independent coincidence may really be valid even where the agreements seem at first sight too significant to be accidental.²

¹ But it will be noted that these two sets of instances, if valid at all, are valid only for *two* separate recensions: for those in class *b* are cited as suggesting a recension of the Second Gospel represented in the copy used by Mt. and Lc., those in class *a* to a recension of it not represented in their copy.

² Let us examine one of the more striking cases in Sir John Hawkins' list, Mc. vi 32, 33 = Mt. xiv 13, Lc. ix 10, 11, 'and they went away in the boat into a desert place privately: and many saw them going and recognised them, and ran on foot from all the cities to meet there and got ahead of them.' Life-like, but these details ('pedestrian' in the strictest sense) were not in the manner of the other Synoptists, and in particular there are three here of the Marcan peculiarities most liable to their revising hands; the plural verb without subject expressed, the reiterated use of the group *ἐρχεσθαι ἐξέρχεσθαι ἀπέρχεσθαι*, and the fondness for the word *πολύς* 'much' or 'many'—in spite of the smaller bulk of his Gospel, Mark has *ἐρχεσθαι* and its two compounds as often as Luke and nearly as often as Matthew, and *πολύς* oftener than Matthew and decidedly oftener than Luke. Now Matthew and Luke, while in other respects they manipulate their model quite differently to one another, agree in four points against Mark. Both turn the impersonal plural into a personal singular verb: both substitute for the colourless 'went away' the more accurately descriptive 'withdrew'—though the one has *ἀνεχώρησεν*, the other *ὑπεχώρησεν*; both abolish 'many' in favour of 'the multitudes'; and both abbreviate the five words *συνέδραμον ἐκεῖ*

I have left to the last—because with it we reach the point of contact with another department of our subject, that of textual criticism—the *vera causa* which has of all been most steadily overlooked or underestimated, namely, the influence of readings introduced from the text of one Gospel into the text of another. It is the very ABC of the textual history of the Synoptic Gospels that they were exposed to the danger of this conflation from the earliest times. Whatever deductions have been justly made from the universal applicability of the old maxim *brevior lectio potior*, it remains beyond dispute that the copyists of the Christian Gospels were continuously enlarging and supplementing each record by the help of the others. Eusebius drew up his elaborate apparatus or harmony in order to equip the reader of a Gospel manuscript with a check upon its scribe: Jerome, in his preface *Novum opus* to the Vulgate Gospels, emphasises with his accustomed insight this primary cause of corruption, ‘quod in eadem re alius evangelista plus dixit, in alio, quia minus putaverint, addiderunt’, and expatiates upon the value of the Eusebian Canons and sections in this respect, with their system of reference figures in black and red arranged in the margin from the beginning of each Gospel to its end, as adopted by him for the manuscripts of his own translation.

St. Mark was, from an early date, the least familiar of the three Gospels, and therefore his text had, as a rule, even where it was the fullest, less influence over the other two than they had on his and on each other's.

καὶ προήλθον αὐτοὺς into ἡκολούθησαν αὐτῷ—and how better could they give the sense, while refusing to fill their narrative with details that to them only distracted attention from the central figure? If Matthew and Luke had not done this kind of thing elsewhere, such agreements might have been decisive: but the changes are exactly on the lines of the changes one or both are making through the whole extent of the material they take over from St. Mark's Gospel.

But the text of Matthew influenced the scribes of Mark and Luke, the text of Luke the scribes of Mark and Matthew, to an almost incredible extent. It has been the business of critical editors from St. Jerome down to Westcott and Hort to remove, bit by bit, the intrusive matter. And the process is not yet ended: more than one of Sir John Hawkins' final list of significant agreements between Matthew and Luke turn out, by the evidence of what is known as the 'Western' text of the Gospels, to merit the name in no other sense than that the scribes of one Gospel had borrowed from the text of the other. I suspect myself that, if we were to discover better and earlier authorities for the Gospel text, more and more of these supposed agreements would disappear in turn like the rest. As it is, Burkitt notes the following points where 'Western' witnesses throw doubt on Westcott and Hort's text in one or other of Sir John's twenty agreements: (1) Mt. xiii 11 for 'the mysteries' of W. H. (= Lc. viii 10) read 'the mystery' with the Old Latin and the Old Syriac (= Mc. iv 11). (2) Lc. viii 44 for 'the hem' of W. H. (= Mt. ix 20), omit perhaps with D and good Old Latin manuscripts (= Mc. v 27). (3) Lc. xviii 30 for 'manifold' of W. H. (= Mt. xix 29) read 'sevenfold' with D, the Old Latin (including Cyprian), and the margin of the Harclean Syriac: Mc. x 30 'a hundredfold'. (4) Lc. xxii 62 for 'he went out and wept bitterly' of W. H. text (= Mt. xxvi 75) omit with W. H. margin and all the Old Latin manuscripts (= Mc. xiv 72).

Critical treatment of the texts is therefore reducing to a vanishing quantity such agreements of Matthew and Luke against Mark as have survived our other tests. Shall I then be thought overbold if I go on to say that this known cause, the desire of scribes to supplement one account from a fuller account, has probably been operating in cases where none of our extant authorities enable us to check it? The single really striking

instance of agreement, as Burkitt points out, is the common addition in Matthew (xxvi 68) and Luke (xxii 64) of the words 'Who is it that struck thee?' after the simple 'Prophecy' of Mark (xiv 65). Burkitt's own suggestion is that in St. Matthew the words are 'a mistaken addition by the Evangelist': but I prefer to conjecture that it is an undetected insertion by scribes, of the type of dozens of others that we can detect, into the text of Matthew from the text of Luke—seeing that, while the question makes sense in St. Luke, where the covering of our Lord's face has been mentioned, it makes no sense in St. Matthew, where nothing of the sort has been indicated.¹

I have said this in passing because I want to claim a legitimate, if modest, place for conjectural emendation in the text of the New Testament: it was one of Dr. Hort's great merits that he saw the need and stated it. Whatever Divine providence has watched, according to our Christian belief, over the inspired scriptures, we have no sort of right to suppose that it has taken the form of a guarantee that in some one MS or Version or Father the original text of apostle or evangelist has been in each case preserved. But my primary care at this point is to press the moral that the conclusion to which our inquiry has directed us, namely, that there is nothing in the evidence to suggest the existence, anywhere or at any time, of any other Mark than the Mark we know, has been materially helped by evidence of the so-called 'Western' authorities for the Gospel texts. And this moral will serve as a starting-point for what I want to say about the text of the New Testament. If in the higher or literary criticism of the Gospels the one outstanding result of the work of the last generation is the conviction that Mark, and our Mark, is the source of

¹ It is curious (I do not know if it is significant) that eight out of Sir John Hawkins' twenty agreements occur in the two chapters of the Passion Narrative.

the triple tradition, so in the lower or textual criticism all the new discoveries, all the new researches, point in the one direction of an increased value to be set upon the 'Western' text.

VIII

The publication in 1881 of Westcott and Hort's *New Testament in Greek* marked in more than one sense an epoch.

When the Greek Testament first appeared in print, the fact itself, the challenge to the secular dominance of the Vulgate Latin in the Western Church, was so absorbing that editors and scholars thought little of the possible variations between Greek authorities—and indeed the materials were hardly then at their disposal. What in effect they set over against the Vulgate Latin was the Vulgate Greek: and for a century and a half all editions followed, with only minute variations, in the steps of Erasmus (1516) and Robert Estienne (1546), though it is fair to chronicle the beginnings of an independent text in the beautiful little octavo due to Simon Colinaeus (Paris 1534) and the beginnings of a critical apparatus in Estienne's folio of 1550. To our own Oxford Press belong the real commencements of the record of divergent evidence at the foot of the page, in bishop Fell's modest edition of 1675 and the more stately volume of Mill in 1707. But again a century elapsed between the first edition with regular apparatus and the first edition that threw over the tradition of the text as received, and reconstructed it in accordance with the evidence. Griesbach's two editions (1774-1777, 1796-1806), Lachmann (1842-1850), Tregelles (1857-1872: prolegomena edited by Hort and Streane in 1879), Tischendorf (editio octava critica maior 1869-

1872: prolegomena by C. R. Gregory,¹ 1884-1894), represent a gradual development of critical texts that culminated, in the period just anterior to Dr. Sanday's return to Oxford, in the great edition of Westcott and Hort.

Whether as based on an ever-growing consensus on the principles of criticism or as itself recommended by the unequalled knowledge and acumen of the principal editor, it is small wonder that this text has exercised a sway that is even yet hardly undermined over the world of scholars. And synchronous as it was with the revision of the Authorised Version of the English Bible, it is small wonder again that it at once brought the textual problem into the arena of the fiercest public discussion. It is difficult to realise that barely more than a generation has passed since Burgon's onslaught on the Greek text of the revisers, so completely have the old war-cries been silenced, so wholly has the controversy as to the original text of the New Testament writings moved away on to fresh ground. So far as the work of the critical editors and of Hort in particular was directed to the substitution of the text attested by the oldest Greek MSS for the text attested by the mass of mediaeval MSS, the issue has been settled once for all. The *textus receptus* is as dead as Queen Anne.

Nevertheless an inquiry into textual origins will do well to take its starting-point in the *Receptus*, not merely because that was historically the text in possession throughout the Byzantine period and for two centuries of printed editions, but because its first beginnings can be fixed with more precision of time and place than any other ancient form of text. The Antiochene fathers of the fourth and fifth centuries, chief among them Chrysostom and Theodoret, witness to this form and to no

¹ Dr. Gregory, a Frenchman by descent, an American by birth, a German by long residence, fell in the great war, fighting gallantly as a septuagenarian on the side of his adopted country.

other, while, conversely, no attestation can be found for it earlier than the fourth century. Claim was indeed made in this sense for the Peshitta or Vulgate Syriac version: but the origin of the Peshitta is to be sought, neither in the second century, as Burgon asserted, nor even in a fourth-century revision, as Hort supposed, but in the work of the great Rabbula, bishop of Edessa from 411 to 435. 'He translated by the wisdom of God that was in him the New Testament from Greek into Syriac, because of its variations, exactly as it was.' Burkitt has shown that there is before the fifth century no evidence in extant Syriac literature—in particular none from St. Ephraem—that points to the use of the Peshitta,¹ so that all the probabilities converge on the suggestion that the new translation of the bishop of Edessa was nothing else than the Peshitta itself, recommended by the prestige of his name and authority to the almost instantaneous acceptance of the Syriac-speaking Churches. The Peshitta, Theodoret, and Chrysostom, are witnesses who point clearly to the fourth century and to Antioch as the home and the period of the new Greek text. And since we have definite testimony from St. Jerome that the illustrious scholar Lucian of Antioch, martyred in A. D. 311,² produced a recension of the Greek Gospels, characterised by the intrusion of unauthentic matter—and the *Receptus* does in fact contain conflate readings and additions from parallel passages of one Gospel into another—I think it unnecessarily cautious on Hort's part to prefer the title 'Syrian recension' to the more definite 'recension of Lucian'.

In 1883, the alternative texts whose merits were debated were still only the Received text and the text

¹ *S. Ephraim's Quotations from the Gospel* (Texts and Studies, vii 2), 1901: *Evangelion da-Mepharreshe*, 1904.

² There are not so many scholars who were martyrs or martyrs who were scholars that we can afford to drop his name, as it is now proposed to do, from our Prayer Book kalendar.

of the great Greek uncial MSS: it is therefore the more noticeable that Dr. Sanday in his summary of the question lets fall (p. 41) the pregnant remark that the Received text, though 'not demonstrably ancient' itself, was largely made up of ancient elements. Where Lucian gives a conflate reading, the two limbs of the conflation were each of them *ex hypothesi* in existence already; and in view of the paucity of Antiochene evidence (indeed of any Eastern Greek evidence save Alexandrine) from the second and third centuries, the texts that are embedded in the *Receptus* are a source of knowledge not to be disregarded. Dr. Sanday refers (p. 44) to collections of material that he had made with a view of probing farther into the origin and distribution of varieties of text—it is only since his death that I have fully understood how extensive his preparations were, or how many notebooks and folio sheets were filled with elaborately tabulated evidence of the earlier witnesses—and these he hoped to reduce 'before very long' to shape, and offer them as his contribution to the debate. What in the end he did do can be seen in the second part (1886) of the series inaugurated under the auspices of bishop (at that time professor) John Wordsworth and himself, *Old Latin Biblical Texts*: and valuable as is the whole series, the nucleus of it is contained in this edition of the precious fragment of the Gospels as St. Cyprian read them, known as *k*, and in Sanday's minute investigation (pp. xlii-clxvi, 95-122) of its palaeography, its style, its diction, and of the Greek text that lies behind it. This work on the earliest type of Latin Gospel MSS was the first-fruits of Sanday's professorial activity, and it was intended to be followed by parallel work on the New Testament citations of the earliest Western Fathers. The first beginnings of the *Novum Testamentum S. Irenaei* must go back at least five and thirty years: I myself was employed in revising for him the *apparatus criticus* of Old Latin authorities

before I went to Magdalen in 1889, proofs began to come in certainly as far back as 1894, and it is almost a full decade since I completed my own share of the book with a series of 'Notes, Additions, and Corrections to the text of the Gospels and Acts'. For several years the book has only been waiting for the preface and summary of results: Dr. Sanday had made, I think, several efforts to accomplish this, but he was anxious to satisfy his fastidious judgement on the date of the Latin Irenaeus—about which his two principal collaborators held divergent views—and his later interests had moved rather far from textual criticism and patristic literature. It was worth while waiting for something from his pen: but now that we may no longer look for that, the call for speedy publication is imperious.

Even more important would be a re-edition of St. Cyprian's *Testimonia*, or 'handbook of Scripture proofs', to which our Seminar devoted itself during several successive years: I have myself collated or re-collated most of the older MSS, and after the Irenaeus is off the stocks I look forward to grappling with the companion project. There should be no insuperable difficulties about its accomplishment, for the guiding principles are as clear to us now as they were obscure to Hartel when that scholar edited St. Cyprian for the Vienna *Corpus* half a century ago.

But the Irenaeus is not the only undertaking which stands between the Cyprian and immediate publication. To yet another great department of Latin Bible study Oxford has given of its best; and we can augur a happier future and speedier completion of the edition of the Vulgate New Testament, now that the partner of bishop Wordsworth's labours has returned to settle among us. No one who knows the conditions of the problem could have reasonably expected that any new text of the Vulgate should take us back at one stride from the official Sixtine and Clementine Bibles to the

autographs of St. Jerome. The editors have recovered the text as Cassiodorus published it in Southern Italy in the middle of the sixth century: but there is still a gap to be bridged between a sixth-century edition, however carefully executed, and the original work. Dom Chapman, in his *Notes on the Early History of the Vulgate Gospels* (Oxford 1908), began breaking up the ground: I hope myself to write one chapter of the missing history by editing the fragments of a St. Gall MS of the Vulgate Gospels (not used by Wordsworth and White), coeval with Cassiodorus in date but representative of a quite different locality. My transcript has stood in type since 1907: only in the present summer was I able to revisit Switzerland in order to finish off my work with the help of a new method of decipherment which I had only found out on my previous visit in time to apply it to the two later Gospels. Now that I have done my best with the text, the patience of the Clarendon Press must be no longer abused, and the St. Gall book must take precedence of the *Testimonia*.

In thus describing the study given by Sanday and others during the last generation to the Latin New Testament, I am not losing sight of my main purpose in this section of my lecture. For if the task of Hort and his immediate predecessors was to establish by irrefragable proofs the superiority of the great Greek MSS to the *textus receptus*, our task to-day is to inquire how far exclusive dependence on these few Greek witnesses should be modified by taking account of other equally ancient texts attested in the versions. Translation of the New Testament into the vernacular languages does not in my own judgement go as far back as most critics have been inclined to think: Greek was the sacred language of the primitive Christians in something of the same way, though not to the same degree, as Hebrew was of the Jews. But the origin of the earliest versions, the Old Latin, the Old Syriac, and the Old

Coptic, ante-dates in any case the earliest extant Greek MSS. Naturally the Old Latin was the first to become known to Western scholars, and it was to define the type of text found in Latin MSS and Latin Fathers that the geographical title 'Western' was invented by Griesbach. But the name became a mere conventional label when the monasteries of the East yielded up to explorers first one and then a second early Gospel text from the Syriac-speaking church. The Syriac *Diatessaron* of Tatian may indeed have owed its 'Western' character to the original Greek MS of the Gospels out of which Tatian constructed his Harmony at Rome. But the 'Separate Gospels' of the church of Edessa were an indigenous and not an imported product, and were rendered no doubt into Syriac from the text of the nearest, or the nearest important, Greek-speaking Church. So long as the Peshitta was supposed to contain the primitive form of the Syriac New Testament, that Greek text would have corresponded roughly to the *Receptus*. But we have now in our hands the evidence of an earlier translation, that stands in the same sort of relation to the Peshitta as the Old Latin to the Vulgate. In 1858 Cureton published his *Remains of a very antient Recension of the Four Gospels in Syriac*: the 'remains' were already sufficient to indicate the 'Western' affinities of the recension, and the proof was clenched when a more complete and purer Old Syriac Gospel text was detected as the underlying writing of a palimpsest noticed and photographed by Mrs. Lewis and her sister, Mrs. Gibson, at Mount Sinai. The preliminary edition in 1894 was followed by more than one issue of supplementary material, and the evidence of both the Curetonian and the Sinaitic was combined in Burkitt's *Evangelion da-Mepharreshe*, 1904. Of all additions, since the publication of Westcott and Hort, to our knowledge of the early texts of the Gospels, this Sinai Syriac MS is the most weighty.

Agreement between the Greek texts represented in the Old Latin and the Old Syriac respectively must be extraordinarily significant, unless the sources of the two versions can be brought so near one another that their consensus ceases to represent independent lines of descent. At one time Dr. Sanday had looked to Antioch and the personnel of the Roman administration there for the first Latin translators of the New Testament. But it is not only the Latin texts of the Western Church that are 'Western'; we have behind them the Greek Testament used by Irenaeus and Tatian: and the presumption in favour of Rome or Africa as the home of the primitive Latin Bible is overwhelming.

Not so old as the Old Latin or the Old Syriac, but still not later than the end of the third century, is the Old Coptic: and of this, too, our knowledge has been materially enlarged, now that Mr. Horner has followed up his edition of the relatively unimportant Memphitic or North-Egyptian version (1898-1905) with the Gospels (1911) and Pauline Epistles (1920) in the Thebaic or Sahidic dialect of Southern Egypt: it is, of course, what we should expect, that an Egyptian vernacular version was first wanted in the districts most remote from the Greek culture of Alexandria. And the Old Coptic, though not so definitely Western as the Latin or the Syriac, is not without 'Western' elements.

The weak point in the external evidence for the 'Western' text was the comparative absence of support for it among the Greek uncial MSS. The solitary exception was the Graeco-Latin Codex Bezae (D), and it was always possible to urge that not only was the origin of a bilingual MS to be sought in regions where Greek was not the dominant language, but also that in such MSS the text in the Greek page or column was peculiarly liable to be adapted, in the course of successive copying, to the text of the vernacular. And in the case of D it is not easy to resist the suspicion that this

tendency has in fact been at work. Within the last few years, however, a Greek MS of the Four Gospels, written probably before the end of the fifth century, and therefore as old as any of our MSS except $\aleph$ and B, has been purchased (1906) in Egypt by an American collector, Mr. C. L. Freer, and will eventually find its home in Washington. Most of the letters of the alphabet having been already annexed for important MSS, the new discovery will be known as W, a letter which hitherto had been employed to denominate only some small fragments.¹ And W is an Egyptian Gospel-book of a Western type: it arranges the Gospels in the Western order, Matthew John Luke Mark, and in one part of St. Mark's Gospel it corresponds almost word for word with the important Old Latin MS *e*—next to *k* the best representative of the African text. When *e* gives us in Mc. i 27 'quaenam esset doctrina haec in-potentabilis' and W $\tau\acute{\iota}\varsigma \eta \delta\iota\delta\alpha\chi\eta \kappa\alpha\iota\nu\eta \alpha\upsilon\tau\eta \eta \epsilon\acute{\xi}\theta\upsilon\sigma\iota\alpha\text{-}\sigma\tau\iota\kappa\eta \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$, the one might seem to have been the actual model of the other.²

The plain fact is that the 'Neutral' text (to use Hort's phrase for the type to which he pinned his faith) has little or no support outside Egypt and Palestinian Caesarea, and only a qualified support from the earliest witnesses of Egypt itself. The one version that is most fundamentally 'Neutral' is the Memphitic or Bohairic: but then that version, of which Hort wrote that 'the greater part cannot well be later than the second century', is now by competent Coptic scholars transferred to the fifth. The oldest Egyptian father whose works

¹ I am not sure that I did not myself propose this symbol to Dr. Gregory at the time when he was corresponding with foreign scholars (1907 or 1908?) about the advantages (or otherwise) of renaming all our Greek MSS.

² *The New Testament Manuscripts in the Freer Collection: Part I, The Washington MS of the Four Gospels.* By Henry A. Sanders, University of Michigan. 1912. See especially pp. 64 ff. I ought to say that I am very far from agreeing with the judgements of the editor on problems of textual criticism: but his work is indispensable.

are extant is Clement of Alexandria: and Clement's affinities are now discovered to be not with B and the Coptic Versions, but with D and the Old Latin.¹ It is true that a papyrus leaf of the third century,² containing most of Matt. i 1-20, presents some very striking agreements, especially in orthography, with B: but on the other hand, the two oldest Greek MSS of the Western type are localised, W certainly, D according to the independent opinion of Prof. A. C. Clark and Dr. E. A. Lowe, to Egypt. Long ago Griesbach indicated the probability that Origen used an 'Alexandrine' (what Hort would call a Neutral) text of St. Mark while writing his Commentary on St. John, and a Western text of St. Mark while writing his Commentary on St. Matthew. It seems clear that both the Western and the Neutral types of New Testament text existed in Egypt before the end of the third century: but the earlier of the two, so far as our extant evidence goes, was the Western, and if the emergence and popularity of one or the other was due to a definite recension, that recension must be what we have before us in $\aleph$ and B. It is very difficult, in face of a common error shared by $\aleph$ B like Mc. iv 21 'ought not the lamp to be put *under* the lampstand?'—*ὑπὸ* for *ἐπὶ*—to deny the existence of a common strain in their near ancestry. It is another matter whether we can go on with von Soden³ to identify the author of this recension with the Hesychius whose work on the LXX and on the Gospels Jerome mentions side by side

¹ *Biblical Text of Clement of Alexandria*, P. M. Barnard and F. C. Burkitt (Texts and Studies v 5, 1899), p. xi.

² *Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, ed. Grenfell and Hunt, i p. 4: with B alone it gives the spellings *ῥαπε* in v. 3 and *οὐρεῖον* in v. 6: with B (and D in St. Luke) *μαθθον* in v. 15: with $\aleph$ B *k* and the Egyptian versions (therefore rightly) *βοες* in v. 5. Also the correct *δευκαρισται* in v. 19 with B *k* Eus.

³ The vast edition of Baron Hermann von Soden, *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments in ihrer ältesten erreichbaren Textgestalt* (I i, 1902; I ii, 1906; I iii, 1907; I iv, 1910; II, 1913: in all about 3,150 quarto pages) must be mentioned with all honour: but I find it an almost impossible book to use with advantage.

with Lucian's. For myself I should rather think of Origen. In any case, the κ B recension can hardly be later than A. D. 250.

What amount of alteration in our critical texts would follow on a fuller recognition of the claim of the 'Western' witnesses to contribute their quota towards the restoration of the apostolic autographs? This is the sum of the whole matter: and of course the argument from the superior antiquity and universality of the 'Western' text is inconclusive until it is reinforced by argument from the superior probability of Western readings. In textual criticism external and internal evidence are alike indispensable. Perhaps, therefore, the best way to point the moral of this and the preceding section of my Lecture will be to cite a few variants, both important and unimportant, in St. Mark's Gospel, where the printed texts should (as I think) be altered in accordance with the text of some or all of the 'Western' authorities, and to illustrate further by two or three examples the occasional employment of the more drastic remedies of transposition or emendation.¹

(a) Mc. i 41 καὶ σπλαγχνισθεὶς ἐκτείνας τὴν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ ἤψατο (Mt. viii 3 = Lc. v 13 καὶ ἐκτείνας τὴν χεῖρα ἤψατο αὐτοῦ). For σπλαγχνισθεὶς D affr* Ephraem with W. H. margin read ὀργισθεὶς: rightly, because if σπλαγχνισθεὶς had stood in St. Mark's text (i) Matthew and Luke would not both have omitted it, (ii) it is inconceivable that any scribes should have changed σπλαγχνισθεὶς to ὀργισθεὶς; whereas if ὀργισθεὶς were original, we can understand both why Mt. and Lc. dropped the word, and why an early scribe of Mc. altered it.

(b) Mc. iii 7 καὶ πολὺ πλῆθος ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλιλαίας ἠκολούθησεν καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰουδαίας καὶ ἀπὸ Ἱεροσολύμων . . . καὶ περὶ Τύρον καὶ Σιδῶνα πλῆθος

¹ It is not contended that the 'Western' authorities are always, or even that (unless united) they are generally right, but only that their evidence can no longer be neglected—as it was neglected in the text of Westcott and Hort. Even so, it should not be forgotten that (1) W. H. were the first editors to follow the 'Western' tradition in what they awkwardly called its 'Non-interpolations', and (2) their margin goes farther in the recognition of Western readings than their text.

πολὺ ἀκούοντες ὅσα ποιεῖ ἦλθον πρὸς αὐτόν (cf. Mt. xii 15, iv 25: Lc. vi 17). Here ἠκολούθησεν is omitted by D, two cursives, the Old Latin, and the Old Syriac: rightly, for (i) the sentence is complete without it, ἦλθον being the verb for the whole sentence, while the insertion produces an anacoluthon; (ii) it is inserted by different authorities at different points, after Γαλιλαίας (A B L), after Ἰουδαίας (N C Δ 33), after Σιδῶνα (W); (iii) some insert ἠκολούθησεν sing., some ἠκολούθησαν plur.; (iv) the word is found in both parallels in Matthew, and may have been inserted from them in the hope of easing a long sentence—if indeed the word was not the natural one to insert without the authority of any specific parallel.

(c) Mc. iii 31 καὶ ἔρχονται ἡ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ αὐτοῦ. Here ἔρχεται is read by N D W, the cursive ι, and the best Old Latins: it is supported by the parallel παρεγένετο in Lc. viii 19: and the singular is exactly in St. Mark's style, i 36 κατεδίωξεν αὐτὸν Σίμων καὶ οἱ μετ' αὐτοῦ (here it is the N B group which is right), viii 27 ἐξῆλθεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς καὶ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ. There was a persistent tendency on the part of scribes to smooth away such apparently ungrammatical phrases.

(d) Mc. vii 24 ἀπηλθεν εἰς τὰ ὄρια Τύρου καὶ Σιδῶνος. The last two words are omitted by D L W Δ, Old Latins, Old Syriac, and Origen, with W. H. margin, rightly: for in fact our Lord was at Tyre and came back through Sidon (v. 31). St. Matthew, from whose parallel text (xv 21) the words 'and Sidon' have come into St. Mark, was not so much interested in the details of the route, and lumps together the two references in St. Mark 'to Tyre' 'from Tyre through Sidon' into the single reference 'to Tyre and Sidon'.

(e) Mc. viii 26 (Textus Receptus) καὶ ἀπέστειλεν αὐτὸν εἰς τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ λέγων Μηδὲ εἰς τὴν κώμην εἰσέλθης μηδὲ εἴπῃς τινὶ ἐν τῇ κώμῃ: W. H. omit the last six words with N B 1 and the Sinai Syriac; *k*, with *nemini dixeris in castello*, omits the previous five words; D ὑπαγε εἰς τὸν οἶκόν σου καὶ μηδενὶ εἴπῃς εἰς τὴν κώμην: other combinations in minor authorities of these various elements. Now here two things may be safely said at once: the reading of T. R. is a conflation of two earlier readings, that of N B and that of *k*; and the ὑπαγε εἰς τὸν οἶκόν σου of D, the Ferrar group, and some Latins, can hardly stand against the earliest Greek and Latin and Syriac evidence which unite in rejecting it—no doubt the preceding words 'sent him home' suggested the addition of the words 'go home' from Mc. ii 11, v 19. The real question comes when we compare the two elements which between them make up the Lucianic reading, and ask which of the two should be preferred, N B with the Sinai Syriac on the one side, or *k* (supported here by D, &c.) on the other. Neither reading can be explained out of the alternative reading, as they stand. I suspect myself that they are two independent expansions of a shorter and rougher text, Μηδὲ εἰς τὴν κώμην without any verb; a friend suggests that Μηδὲ εἴπῃς εἰς τὴν κώμην would also account for the divergences.

(f) Mc. x 2 καὶ προσελθόντες Φαρισαῖοι ἐπηρώτων αὐτὸν . . . πειράζοντες αὐτόν. The words προσελθόντες Φαρισαῖοι are omitted by D a b k and the Sinai Syriac, and by the margin of W. H. : and a general consideration of the position suggests that omission is right. Pharisees are first mentioned at Capernaum in Mc. ii 16-24: they are the local Pharisees of Galilee, and their first attitude is that of questioners, ii 16, 24, though they soon join forces with the Herodians to plot against Jesus, iii 6. We do not hear of them again till vii 1-5, and then they are in company with 'scribes from Jerusalem', but the scene is in Galilee, probably at Capernaum, still. Once more (viii 11) on the return to the Lake of Galilee, they 'come out', presumably from the town, to dispute with Him and test Him. But their activity is connected throughout with the neighbourhood of the populous places on the Lake of Galilee, and we do not expect to find them on the circuitous road up to Jerusalem which our Lord was now following. The insertion was prompted primarily by the parallel in St. Matthew (xix 3), but also by the persistent connexion of πειράζειν with the questions of the Pharisees, cf. viii 11.

(g) Mc. x 19 μὴ ἀποστερήσης. Here we have not a right omission by Westerns, but a wrong omission (following Mt. and Lc.) by B 1 and the Sinai Syriac: on this occasion W. H. throw over B. The word is necessary somewhere in the Gospels to account for the emphasis laid on this point in early Christian ethics: see Pliny's Letter to Trajan 'ne furta, ne latrocinia, ne adulteria committerent, ne fidem fallerent, ne depositum appellati abnegarent', Hermas *Mand.* viii 5 πολλά ἐστὶν ἀφ' ὧν δεῖ τὸν δούλον τοῦ θεοῦ ἐγκριτεῦσθαι κλέμμα, ψεῦδος, ἀποστέρησις, ψευδομαρτυρία, πλεονεξία κτλ. (where the Old Latin version has *abnegatio* for ἀποστέρησις, just as k has *ne abnegaveris* in Mc. x 19); and compare the inclusion of *fraus* among the irremissible sins according to the Western penitential discipline. And the only passage in the Gospels to which we can refer it is this passage in St. Mark.

(h) Mc. xvi 1 καὶ διαγενομένου τοῦ σαββάτου ἡ Μαρία ἡ Μαγδαληνὴ καὶ Μαρία ἡ τοῦ Ἰακώβου καὶ Σαλώμῃ ἡγόρασαν ἀρώματα. Here D k omit the names of the holy women (though the evidence of D is discounted by its omitting also the three preceding words), as I believe rightly. The clause will then be read closely with what precedes in xv 47 'And Mary the Magdalene and Mary the mother of Joseph watched to see where he was laid, and when sabbath was past bought spices to go and anoint him'. The objections to the ordinary reading are (i) that it makes the Evangelist describe the second Mary in one verse as 'mother of Joseph' and in the next verse as 'mother of James', (ii) that it leaves it absolutely inexplicable why St. Matthew and St. Luke in copying St. Mark should agree on leaving out here all mention of Salome. Mc. xv 40 is reproduced in Mt. xxvii 56, Mc. xv 47 in Mt. xxvii 61 (Lc. gives no names at either of these points, reserving them for the witness to the empty tomb), but neither Matthew nor Luke

suggests that Salome was present on Easter Sunday morning—it was ‘Mary Magdalene and the other Mary’ (Mt. xxviii 1), ‘Mary Magdalene and Joanna’¹ and Mary the mother of James’ (Lc. xxiv 10).

One or two suggestions for transposition or emendation may be considered here.

(j) Mc. ix 9-13 ⁹ καὶ καταβαίνοντων αὐτῶν ἐκ τοῦ ὄρους διεστείλατο αὐτοῖς ἵνα μηδενὶ ἂ εἶδον διηγήσωνται, εἰ μὴ ὅταν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστῇ. ¹⁰ καὶ τὸν λόγον ἐκράτησαν πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς συζητοῦντες τί ἐστὶν τὸ ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστῆναι ^{12b} καὶ πῶς γέγραπται ἐπὶ τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἵνα πολλὰ πάθῃ καὶ ἐξουδενηθῇ. ¹¹ καὶ ἐπηρώτων αὐτὸν λέγοντες Ὅτι λέγουσιν οἱ γραμματεῖς ὅτι Ἡλείαν δεῖ ἐλθεῖν πρῶτον; ¹² ὁ δὲ ἔφη αὐτοῖς Ἡλείας μὲν ἐλθὼν πρῶτον ἀποκαθιστάνει πάντα ¹³ ἀλλὰ λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι καὶ Ἡλείας ἐλήλυθεν καὶ ἐποίησαν αὐτῷ ὅσα ἤθελον, καθὼς γέγραπται ἐπ’ αὐτόν. I have printed the text here in the shape that I believe the Evangelist intended to give it, though all our authorities put the clause ¹² ὁ καὶ πῶς . . . ἐξουδενηθῇ into our Lord’s mouth as part of His answer to the disciples’ question. That seems to me intolerably harsh and meaningless. But I do not think that matters are much helped by (what has been suggested) the transposition of the words into the question actually put: I conceive they should be transposed one stage farther back, so as to become part of the question that was not put. Our Lord’s injunction to keep silence about the Transfiguration till after His Resurrection at once reminded the three apostles of the language He had used to them a few days earlier for the first time (viii 31) about the ‘need’ for His suffering many things and being rejected and being put to death and after three days rising again. ‘It must needs be’ means, as in Lc. xxiv 26, 27, ‘the Scriptures truly interpreted teach’, and the disciples followed our Lord’s thought correctly so far as to understand that He was referring them to the teaching of Scripture: and they discussed with one another two things, the meaning of ‘rising again’ and the scriptural authority for the suffering of Messiah. They did not venture to question our Lord directly on these difficulties: they approached the point circuitously, and asked about the scriptural authority for the reappearance of Elijah, and the question they did ask our Lord fully answered.

(k) Mc. iv 29 ὅταν δὲ παραδοῖ ὁ καρπός. I cannot think that any interpretation of these words is satisfactory, and I suggest *καίρος*. The intransitive use of *παραδιδόναι* ‘allow’ is practically only found with nouns of time: L. S. quote from Isocrates *ὅπως ἂν οἱ καιροὶ παραδιδῶσιν* and from Polybius *τῆς ὥρας παραδιδούσης*. And St. Mark is fond of ὁ *καιρός* absolutely (while Mt. and Lc. always omit or alter it), xi 13 ὁ γὰρ *καιρὸς οὐκ ἦν σύκων*, xii 2 *ἀπέστειλεν πρὸς τοὺς*

¹ Joanna is, of course, as Dr. Sanday was fond of pointing out, St. Luke’s own special authority.

γεωργούς τῷ καιρῷ—in both these cases ὁ καιρός means ‘harvest time’—
xiii 33 οὐκ οἶδατε γὰρ πότε ὁ καιρός ἐστιν.

(1) Mc. x 32 ἦσαν δὲ ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ ἀναβαίνοντες εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα, καὶ ἦν προάγων αὐτοὺς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, καὶ ἐθαμβοῦντο, οἱ δὲ ἀκολουθοῦντες ἐφοβοῦντο. There is a serious difficulty in the exegesis of these verses as they stand. It is ordinarily supposed that mention is made of our Lord, of the Twelve, and of a vague mass of followers. But there are two objections, both of them decisive, to such an interpretation. On the one hand, the whole story of the ascent to Jerusalem and the arrival there seems to imply that it was only the few disciples whom He was educating in closest intimacy who now made up His company: on the other hand, the verbs προάγειν and ἀκολουθεῖν are in this Gospel strictly correlative, as in xi 9 οἱ προάγοντες καὶ οἱ ἀκολουθοῦντες, and so xiv 28 (xvi 7) προάξω ὑμᾶς εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν means of course ‘I will precede’ and you shall follow. οἱ δὲ ἀκολουθοῦντες can therefore only refer back to προαγῶν αὐτοὺς and must mean ‘Jesus went before them and they (the disciples) followed’. So far all is clear: but καὶ ἐθαμβοῦντο is unexplained, unless we accept a suggestion made some years ago, but never I believe put into print, and suppose that the Evangelist wrote ἐθαμβεῖτο. If it was the Master on whom, in anticipation of Gethsemane (xiv 33), this shuddering awe fell, we can understand how He wished to be alone, and how the disciples, as they followed at a little distance, ‘were afraid’. *Solve calciamentum pedum tuorum: locus enim in quo stas terra sancta est.*

The Gospel of St. Mark is no doubt not an average specimen, as regards the preservation of its text, of the New Testament books as a whole. For some years it was the only Life of our Lord in circulation, at a time when tradition must still have been vigorous and the sacredness of canonical authority was a thing wholly in the future: and when the longer Lives that were built up on it took its place, the greater vogue they enjoyed reacted again upon the text of the now almost superseded Gospel. We can check, more or less, the intrusion of Matthaean and Lucan elements during the second and third centuries into the text of St. Mark: it is more difficult to check the alterations or corruptions that it may have undergone in the half century after its composition. Such changes were mostly no doubt small, and many of them accidental rather than deliberate. But it has to be recognised that some books of the New

Testament were, for one reason or another, more exposed than others to danger in the course of transcription during the period before canonical authority attached to them. In this class would fall the Apocalypse, the Pastoral Epistles, probably the Acts, and certainly the Second Gospel.

IX

The language of the New Testament is the natural pendant to the text of the New Testament: and if there has been, of recent years, a certain slackening in the energy devoted in the previous generation to the question of text, the study of the language has made an entirely new start. A whole field of knowledge has been opened up by the discovery and publication of the papyrus documents which archaeological exploration in Egypt, especially since the commencement in 1882 of the British occupation, has brought in a never-ceasing flow within our reach. Papyrus manuscripts are among the rarities of Western libraries, so ruinous is the effect of damp upon the frail material on which books were normally written till the third century of our era. But the Egyptian climate preserves intact in Egyptian rubbish heaps the débris not only of the stately rolls of literary works but of letters, accounts, and miscellaneous documents, private and public: and fragments of all sorts and sizes in the various collections now published (in which work Prof. Grenfell and Prof. Hunt have represented with distinction our nation and University) bring before us the daily life of the Greek-speaking population during the three centuries of the government of the Ptolemies and during twice that length of the Roman dominion. The first question which most of us still ask with regard to any new finds is what literary texts, classical or theological, known or not known, are represented in them: and the instinct which

prompts that question is a sound one. But if the results are perhaps from that point of view a little bit disappointing (though I still cherish hope of a Greek text of *Hermas*), the non-literary documents have for the first time enabled us to realise what kind of Greek the contemporaries of the Apostles wrote in familiar and informal intercourse. And to some scholars it must have been rather a surprise—so habituated had we become to explain everything that was not classical in the New Testament writers as a Hebraism or a Semitism—to find that the Greek-speaking inhabitants of Egypt used the same idioms and developed the language on the same lines as the Greek-speaking inhabitants of Palestine. Even the LXX translators have many more points of contact than we had fancied with their non-Jewish neighbours in Egypt. Dr. Hatch, in his *Essays on Biblical Greek* (1889), had made some use of inscriptions: but to Adolf Deissmann, then a country pastor, belongs the credit of first applying the new material from the papyri to the linguistic study of the Bible.¹ In England the conclusions indicated by Deissmann were accepted and extended from the linguistic to the grammatical sphere in the *Prolegomena to a Grammar of New Testament Greek* (1906) by the late Dr. J. H. Moulton, whose death is not the least of the losses which the war inflicted on the cause of learning. And the *Vocabulary of the Greek Testament*, edited by Dr. Moulton and Dr. Milligan (Part i, 1914: ii, 1915: iii, 1919) applies on a larger scale the method which Deissmann employed on a number of specimen words.

With this particular development of the subject I

¹ *Bibelstudien: Beiträge, zumeist aus den Papyri und Inschriften, zur Geschichte der Sprache, des Schrifttums und der Religion des hellenistischen Judentums und des Urchristentums*, 1895. *Neue Bibelstudien: sprachgeschichtliche Beiträge, zumeist aus den Papyri und Inschriften, zur Erklärung des Neuen Testaments*, 1897. Also translated into English.

cannot claim much first-hand acquaintance. But I have been for a good number of years deeply interested in lexical work, if only because Dr. Sanday and myself with Dr. Strong, then dean of Christ Church now bishop of Ripon, were responsible for the adoption in this University of the plan, conceived and fostered by the late Dr. Swete, of a Lexicon of Patristic Greek: and Patristic Greek has its roots of course in Biblical and especially in New Testament Greek. This Lexicon is an undertaking well worth the pains, for it would fill an obvious gap between Suicer's *Thesaurus*, which is not a Lexicon and which is besides two centuries old, and Sophocles' *Lexicon of Byzantine Greek*, which has little contact with theological language or with the fathers as theologians. But though it is worth the pains, it will not be done without pains: and that means that it will not be done unless all among us who can will contribute of their special knowledge and their special gifts. I hope that I shall not be thought to be deserting the duties of my Chair if I devote some of my energy as Professor to the furthering of an undertaking for which I am in part responsible and which is cognate at least to the study of Biblical Greek.

X

One department at least of Patristic Greek falls directly under the province of a Professor of Exegesis, I mean, the commentators on the Bible: and probably the most laborious piece of work that I myself ever accomplished was an article on 'Greek Patristic Commentaries on the Pauline Epistles' for the supplement-volume of Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible* (1904). 'It is one of the traditions of the English Church to pay due regard to patristic exegesis, and one from which I hope not to depart': the words are not my own, but Dr. Sanday's (p. 59). Certainly it is remarkable how much good

work has been done by English scholars in this direction. Chrysostom on St. Matthew, Cyril on St. John, Chrysostom Theodore and Theodoret on St. Paul, are read in the editions, produced in the generation before 1883, of Field, Marriott, Pusey, Swete: and since that date we have to our credit Robinson's *Philocalia* (1893), Burkitt's *Rules of Tyconius* (1894), Brooke's *Origen on St. John* (1896), and Souter's *Ambrosiaster, In V. et N. T. Quaestiones* (1908)—the only theological writing edited from Great Britain in the *Vienna Corpus*. To the elucidation and textual criticism of the catena fragments of Origen on the Pauline Epistles as re-edited in the *Journal of Theological Studies*¹ I gave myself what help I could: and I count myself fortunate to have been able to assist in any degree in the recovery of what the greatest of Christian thinkers and scholars wrote in exposition of the meaning of him who was known in the early Church by the unique title of 'the Apostle'.

The burden of interpreting adequately the New Testament writings and of presiding over the whole domain of New Testament study in the University would be beyond the powers of any man: much more, when it has fallen to one who is no theologian but only a historian and critic, must he entreat for charitable judgement if he prove himself in too many ways unequal to the task.

¹ Origen on the Ephesians, edited by J. A. F. Gregg (now bishop of Ossory), iii 233, 398, 554 [1902]: on 1 Corinthians, edited by C. Jenkins (ix 231, 353, 500, x 29 [1908]: cf. x 270): on Romans, edited by A. Ramsbotham (xiii 209, 35, xiv 10 [1912]); and for Origen's Scholia on the Apocalypse see xiii 295, 386 [1912].

BOOKS BY DR. SANDAY

SACRED SITES OF THE GOSPELS, by W. SANDAY, with the assistance of PAUL WATERHOUSE. 1903. 8vo, pp. viii + 126, with fifty-five plates and six maps and plans. 13s. 6d. net.

CRITICISM OF THE FOURTH GOSPEL. Eight Lectures on the Morse Foundation. 1905. 8vo, pp. xvi + 268. 10s. net.

THE LIFE OF CHRIST in Recent Research. 1907. 8vo, pp. viii + 328, with two illustrations. 10s. net.

CHRISTOLOGIES Ancient and Modern. 1910. 8vo, pp. x + 244. 6s. net.

PERSONALITY IN CHRIST and in Ourselves. 1911. 8vo, pp. 76. Paper cover, 2s. net. Also bound with Christologies Ancient and Modern. 7s. 6d. net.

THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION: The Presidential Address delivered at the opening of the Christian Section of the Third International Congress of the History of Religions. 1908. Royal 8vo, pp. 20. 1s. net.

THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH AND RE-UNION. Papers reprinted from the Contemporary Review. 1913. 8vo, pp. 142, with an index. 4s. 6d. net.

OXFORD STUDIES IN THE SYNOPTIC PROBLEM by members of the University of Oxford edited by W. SANDAY. 1911. 8vo, pp. xxviii + 456, with a frontispiece. 15s. net.

AT THE CLARENDON PRESS



BS
2521
.T9

629396

Turner

Study of the New
Testament.

Paul Schmitt

DEC 4 1946

D. George

2-30-46

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO



48 453 449